





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

Ecc.  
cot.  
S.

# HISTORY

OF

# THE COVENANTERS

IN

# SCOTLAND.

BY THE

AUTHOR OF THE HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION, ETC.

~~~~~  
“Thy persecuted children, Scotia, foiled  
“A tyrant’s and a bigot’s bloody laws.”  
~~~~~

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

PHILADELPHIA :  
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

$$\begin{array}{r} \cancel{2}^0 4 \\ \cancel{8} \mid 5 7 9 0 \end{array}$$

## CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

## CHAPTER I.

## CHAPTER II.

Justiciary commissions appointed—proceedings of the circuit courts and the military—Mr. Cargill and Henry Hall of Haughhead seized at the Queensferry—Cargill escapes—death of Hall—declaration found on him—it is disowned by the Covenanters—they publish a declaration and testimony at Sanquhar—efforts of the council to apprehend those concerned—bond of mutual defence agreed upon by Cameron and others—sufferings of the indulged—skirmish at Airsmoss—death of Cameron—cruel treatment of Hackston of Rathillet—his horrid sentence and execution—Archibald Alison and John Malcolm put to death—Mr. Cargill excommunicates the king, &c., at Torwood—the duke of York again visits Scotland—Messrs. Skene, Stewart, and Potter condemned and executed—students burn the pope's effigy, . . . . . 43

### CHAPTER III.

Disgraceful conduct of Sir George M'Kenzie—trial and execution of Isabel Alison and Marion Harvey—outrages committed by the military—violent proceedings of Kennoway—examina-

tion of Mr. Blackader—barbarous treatment of Mr. Spreul—the Gibbites—apprehension of Mr. Donald Cargill—his trial and execution—other four Covenanters put to death—proceedings of parliament—act securing the succession—the test act—its contradictory nature—opposition to it throughout the kingdom—protest given to the Duke of York in Glasgow—trial of six Covenanters before the justiciary—five of them executed, . . . . . 80

#### CHAPTER IV.

The Duke of York enforces the test—reasons by the ministers of Aberdeen for its rejection—Bishop Paterson's explanation—its futility—Argyle takes the test with an explanation—refuses to swear it as a commissioner of the treasury—he is removed from all offices of trust—is imprisoned—his indictment—he is found guilty of treason—escapes from prison—his sentence—consternation of the Protestants in both kingdoms—severe satire on these proceedings by the boys of George Heriot's hospital—state of the Covenanters—the followers of Cargill form themselves into societies—Lanark declaration—violence of the council—case of Mr. Frazer of Brae, . . . . . 119

#### CHAPTER V.

Oppression increases—the Duke of York applauded by the prelates—trial and execution of William Harvey—military inquisition—proceedings of the council—case of Robert Gray—meeting at Tweedsmuir—violent proclamation against the Covenanters—inhuman conduct of the military—examples—trial and execution of James Robertson, John Finlay, and William Cochrane—their reasons for refusing to say “God save the king”—consistency of the Covenanters—case of Alexander Hume of Hume—of William Martin of Dallurg—of William Lawrie of Blackwood—of John Nisbet, younger—enlarged powers granted to the military commissioners—instructions to the curates—the Rye-house plot—other executions—field-preaching revived by Mr. Renwick, . . . . . 149

#### CHAPTER VI.

Court of justiciary proceedings—trial of Sir Hugh Campbell of Cesnock—the evidence against him confounded—he is acquitted—executions at Glasgow—death of Captain Paton—Spence and Carstairs tortured—trial of Baillie of Jerviswood—his striking appeal to M'Kenzie—he is found guilty and executed—rescue of a minister and several Covenanters at Entrekkin Pass—increased persecution—examples—case of Porterfield of Duchal—executions in Edinburgh—dreadful sufferings

of the Covenanters—Mr. Renwick condemned in absence for holding conventicles—Apologetical Declaration—its effects—proceedings against those who refused to disown it—the indulgence recalled—oath of abjuration, . . . . . 196

## CHAPTER VII.

Cruel proceedings of the council and the military—examples—death of Charles II.—accession of James VII.—extreme sufferings of the Covenanters—murder of John Brown and Andrew Hislop by Claverhouse—two women drowned at Wigton—meeting of parliament—iniquitous acts passed by that assembly—Argyle's invasion—precautions used by the council to defeat it—prisoners sent from Edinburgh to Dunnotter castle—their barbarous treatment—Argyle defeated and taken prisoner—his execution—Rumbold and Archer put to death—James exempts the papists from all religious oaths—declaration of the Cameronians against the accession of James to the throne—continued severities—execution of John Nisbet of Hardhill, 232

## CHAPTER VIII.

State of the persecution—death of Mr. Peden—growth of popery—riot in Edinburgh—divisions among the Covenanters—proceedings of parliament regarding the Roman Catholics—James grants toleration to the papists by his own prerogative—proclamation against Mr. Renwick—continued persecution—examples—Informatory Vindication published—James's first and second indulgences rejected by the Presbyterians—a third indulgence proclaimed—it is accepted by the greater part of the ministers—their address to the king—reasons of the society people for refusing the indulgence—their sufferings, . . . 279

## CHAPTER IX.

Sufferings of the indulged ministers—apprehension of Mr. Renwick—his trial and sentence—his behaviour in the prison and on the scaffold—his triumphant death—Mr. Renwick is succeeded in his ministerial labours by Mr. Shields—outrages of the military—rescue of Mr. Houston—antipathy of government to Presbyterianism—arbitrary conduct of James—birth of the Prince of Wales—the Protestants look for deliverance to William, Prince of Orange—examination of Mr. Gordon—announcement of an invasion by the Prince of Orange—address of the bishops to James—William lands in England—James abandons the kingdom, and flies to France—riot in Edinburgh—the curates expelled from their churches—convention of estates—the Revolution completed—conclusion, 311



# HISTORY OF THE COVENANTERS.

## CHAPTER I.

Proclamation against conventicles and the assassins of Sharpe—dreadful sufferings of the Presbyterians—their proceedings at Rutherglen—Claverhouse apprehends Mr. King—he is defeated at Drumclog—the Covenanters march to Glasgow, where they are repulsed—absurd proclamation of the council—disputes among the Covenanters—Duke of Monmouth appointed to command the forces against them—position of the two armies—battle of Bothwell—Covenanters completely routed—barbarous treatment of the prisoners—savage conduct of Claverhouse—trial and execution of Messrs Kid and King—other five of the prisoners put to death at Magus Moor—bond of peace—two hundred and fifty Covenanters shipped for America—they are wrecked at Orkney—renewed persecution in the south and west—circuit courts of judiciary—Duke of York arrives in Edinburgh—M'Ward's remarks on his reception in that city.

INTELLIGENCE of the assassination of Sharpe having reached Edinburgh on the 4th of May, the privy council assembled, and issued a furious proclamation not only against the individuals concerned, but the whole body of the Presbyterians. Having stigmatized the deed as exceeding in cruelty “the barbarity of pagans and heathens,” they absurdly enough add, “daily instances whereof

we are to expect, whilst field conventicles, those rendezvous of rebellion, and forges of all bloody and jesuitical principles, are so frequently followed.” A reward of ten thousand merks was next offered for the apprehension of the assassins, in order to discover whom, every person in the county of Fife was ordered to appear at a certain place, on a given day, to be confronted with the bishop’s servants. The instructions which at the same time were given to the sheriff-deputies are too important to be passed over, namely, “That all males from sixteen years of age and upwards, in each Presbytery, meet on the days appointed: that all the ministers be there, and bring with them the communion rolls: that they mark all of them who come not to church on the account of fanatic or popish principles, and that these be set aside: that all such as are of that tribe be examined and obliged to give an account where they were all the 3d of May, and that they prove what they say by sufficient witnesses: that such as cannot prove a good account of themselves, in manner foresaid, be secured, and their goods seized and secured till the issue of their trial: that such as shall be absent the said day be holden as

probably guilty of the horrid act," &c. These instructions being carried into execution with the utmost rigour, multitudes who knew nothing of the assassination except by report, were subjected to persecution, and robbed of whatever property they possessed.

Another proclamation was issued on the 8th of May, against travelling with arms without license; but the most disgraceful act which was published at this time was one against conventicles. The sanguinary statutes which had been enacted against these meetings had hitherto been executed only in part, but this *lenity* giving great offence to the prelates, orders were now given to the magistrates and military to show no mercy, but to persecute to death every genuine Covenanter throughout the realm. "After mature deliberation," says this disgraceful proclamation, "we have thought fit to declare that we will hereafter order the judges of our respective judicatures, and the officers of all our forces, to proceed against all such who go with any arms to those field meetings, as *traitors*. And lest any may pretend that by the just rigour we will use against such as go to conventicles in arms, we resolve to slacken our prosecution of

other field conventicles, we have, therefore, thought fit—to put our laws in vigorous execution even against those who frequent these field meetings *without arms.*" (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 59.)—The framing of this horrid enactment was the last public deed in which Sharpe was engaged, it having been passed in the council on the 1st of the month, and transmitted to the king for his approbation; "and so," adds Wodrow, "we may reckon this the primate's legacy."

The dreadful scenes which followed, by the execution of these barbarous measures, almost exceed belief. "The Presbyterians," says the author of the Memoirs of the Church of Scotland, "suffered extremities that tongue cannot describe, and which heart can hardly conceive of, from the dismal circumstances of hunger, nakedness, &c.—lying in damp caves, and in hollow clefts of the naked rocks, without shelter, covering, fire or food, none durst harbour, entertain, relieve, or speak to them upon pain of death. Many, for venturing to speak to them, were forced to fly to them, and several put to death for no other offence; fathers were persecuted for supplying their children, and children for nourishing their parents; husbands for har-

bouring their wives, and wives for cherishing their own husbands. The ties and obligations of the laws of nature were no defence, but it was made death to perform natural duties; and many suffered death for acts of piety and charity, in cases where human nature could not bear the thoughts of suffering it."

In consequence of these tyrannical proceedings, the numbers who attended conventicles greatly increased; and, instead of assembling in small parties, as the majority of the Covenanters had done formerly, they drew together in large bodies, with a view to greater safety. When attacked by the military they of course stood on their defence, but if unmolested, they committed no aggressions, and after sermon separated in peace. Those who frequented these meetings, were, in general, averse both to the indulgence and to those who had accepted of it, whom they considered as little better than the curates. At one of these assemblies, Mr. Robert Hamilton,\* brother of Sir William Hamilton of Preston, proposed to

\* Hamilton was not a preacher, as is erroneously stated by Laing and several other historians. Burnet, (vol. ii. p. 819,) in the true Episcopalian style, calls him "a crack brain enthusiast."

publish a testimony against the defections of the times ; (Hind Let Loose, p. 139,) which being acquiesced in, he proceeded to Rutherford-glen with eighty men, on the 29th of May, and having burned the obnoxious acts of parliament, affixed the following declaration to the market cross : “ As the Lord hath been pleased still to keep and preserve his interest in this land, by the testimonies of some faithful witnesses from the beginning ; so, in our day, some have not been wanting, who, through the greatest hazards, have added their testimony to those who have gone before them, by suffering death, banishment, torturings, forfeitures, imprisonments, and what not, from a perfidious and cruel adversary to the church and kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in the land : therefore we, owning the same interest of Christ, according to the word of the Lord, and the national and solemn league and covenants, desire to add our testimony to the testimonies of the worthies that have gone before us ; and that against all things done prejudicial to his interest, from the beginning of the work of reformation, especially from 1648 to 1660, but more particularly from the said year 1660 and downwards,

against the acts following ; the act of supremacy,” &c. The various statutes framed against the Covenanters are then enumerated. “ And we give our testimony against all sinful and unlawful acts, emitted and executed, published and prosecuted by them against our covenanted reformation. And for the confirmation of this our testimony, we do here this day, being the 29th of May, 1679, publicly and most justly burn the foresaid acts at this cross of Rutherglen, being the chief burgh of the nether ward of Clydesdale, as they perfidiously and blasphemously have burned our holy covenants through several cities of these covenanted kingdoms.” (Informatory Vindication, pp. 6, 88. Wilson’s Relation, p. 73.)

While these bold proceedings enraged the council, Graham, of Claverhouse,\* who had

\* The name and deeds of this officer are so well known, that it is scarcely necessary to give any character of him here. In the course of the history we shall have but too much occasion to advert to some of his feats, which, in ferocity, cruelty, and revenge, so far exceeded those of Turner, Bannatyne, or Dalzell, that long after the revolution he was well known throughout the country by the name of *Bloody Claver'se*. Even Sir Walter Scot, notwithstanding his distorted and unfair description, both of the persecutors and the persecuted, is compelled to admit that, in Claverhouse, “under a soft exterior, was hidden a spirit unbounded in daring and in aspiring, yet cautious and prudent as that of Machiavel himself. Profound in politics, and imbued,

signalized himself for some time past by his zeal in executing their orders against the Presbyterians, marched from Glasgow with a party of horse and foot to avenge the affront. Having reached the town of Ham-

of course, with that disregard for individual rights which its intrigues usually generate, this leader was cool and collected in danger, fierce and ardent in pursuing success, careless of death himself, and ruthless in inflicting it upon others."—*Tales of My Landlord*, vol. ii. pp. 287, 288. It is not a little surprising that the same author, who gave to the world such a caricature of the Covenanters as the novel from which we have made the above quotation presents, should be believed to have written the lines following, which appeared in the *Poetic Mirror* :—

"There, worthy of his masters, came  
The despot's champion, *Bloody Graham*,  
To stain for aye a warrior's sword,  
And lead a fierce though fawning horde,  
The human bloodhounds of the earth,  
To hunt the peasant from his hearth !  
—Tyrants ! could not misfortune teach,  
That man has rights beyond your reach ?  
Thought ye the torture and the stake,  
Could that intrepid spirit break,  
Which even in woman's breast withstood  
The terrors of the fire and flood ?"

The unqualified eulogiums of Chambers on this infamous and cruel officer, together with that author's unfounded and unsparing invectives against the eminent men whom he took delight in butchering even in cold blood, are quite unworthy of notice, and leave a foul stain on the work in which they are contained. Let all such writers, however, remember that the doctrines of the persecuted Covenanters are the doctrines of the Church of Scotland, and of every true Presbyterian at the present day.

ilton on Saturday the 31st, he surprised Mr. John King, an intercommuned minister, and fourteen unarmed countrymen, who were waiting to attend a large meeting which was to be held next day at Loudon Hill. To this meeting Claverhouse resolved next to proceed ; and binding the prisoners two and two together, he marched forward early on Sabbath morning, driving them before him like so many sheep. Public worship was begun by Mr. Thomas Douglas, when the congregation were informed of the approach of Claverhouse. About forty horse, and a hundred and fifty or two hundred foot, immediately drew up, resolving to prevent the meeting being dispersed, and, if possible, to rescue the prisoners. They were commanded by Mr. Hamilton, who, although honest in the cause, was destitute of military experience, and too contracted in his views, as well as uncomplying and overbearing in his temper. The bravery of the men, however, supplied at this time any defects in the commander. Having come up with Claverhouse at a place called Drumclog, they received his first fire with firmness, and then discharging their pieces, attacked their assailants sword in hand. The combat was short ;

in a few minutes, the soldiers were completely defeated, and the prisoners rescued. In this rencontre upwards of thirty of the military were killed, a considerable number taken prisoners, who were disarmed and dismissed, and Claverhouse himself, after having his horse shot under him, narrowly escaped. The loss on the Covenanters' side was trifling, two or three only being killed, and a few wounded.\*

Aware of the danger to which they were now exposed, a consultation was held by the Covenanters, whether they should disperse or continue in arms. Preferring the latter alternative, from the dread of the severe revenge which the government would take they marched that night to Hamilton and the next day to Glasgow. Information of the skirmish, however, had already reached that city, and the military there by entrenching themselves in the streets, were prepared for an attack. After a fruitless attempt to dislodge them, the Covenanters were obliged to

\* Previous to this rencontre, Hamilton, on his own authority, issued orders to give no quarter; but this mandate was disregarded, and Hamilton takes the whole blame of it, or rather praise of it, to himself.—Howie's *Faithful Contendings*, p. 201. The same order was given by Claverhouse, and had his party been successful, a very different scene would have taken place. Wilson's *Relation*, p. 74. *Memoirs of Brysson*, p. 282.

retire with the loss of six or seven men \* but being joined by a considerable number of the country people, they marched back to Hamilton and there fixed their camp.

On receiving an incorrect account of these transactions, the council, on the 3d of June, issued a proclamation, ordering “the rebels to lay down their arms and surrender themselves to the Earl of Linlithgow within twenty-four hours, or be treated as traitors, and rendered incapable of mercy ; prohibiting and discharging any person or persons to aid, assist, harbour, reset, or any ways supply the said rebels, under pain of treason ; and certifying masters of families, heritors, and landlords, that if any of their families, servants, or tenants join in the rebellion, they shall be looked upon as disaffected persons.” No promise of indemnity being here made, the Covenanters were compelled either to continue their attempt to shake off the oppressive yoke under which they groaned, or submit their necks to the axe of the executioner. Several other proclamations followed, commanding the militia to be embodied, appoint-

\* The dead bodies of these Covenanters were used with the greatest barbarity by Claverhouse and the soldiers. Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 71.

ing their places of rendezvous, and ordering all heritors "to attend the king's host."

In the mean time the troops at Glasgow abandoned that city and marched to Falkirk, where they were joined by the forces under the Earl of Linlithgow. Afraid of engaging with the Covenanters, the Earl, on the 6th of June, wrote to the council, that "being apprehensive of the dangerous consequences which may follow to his majesty's service if we engage mad zealots with such unequal numbers, the whole officers are of opinion that it is not safe to advance nearer the enemy, and conceive it best to retire to Stirling." The council, however, ordered the forces to repair to Edinburgh, and sent off an express to his majesty, requesting assistance from England.

The greater part of the west country being now in possession of the Covenanters, their numbers gradually increased, though it would appear that they never exceeded five thousand men. No plan, however, had been formed ;\* and a lamentable division at this

\* If there had been any designs or preparations made formerly for a rebellion," says Burnet, "now they had time enough to run together and to form themselves; but it appeared that there had been no such designs." Hist. vol. ii. p. 820.

time took place, which ultimately proved the ruin of the undertaking. Hamilton and those who had been called to take the lead in the sudden and unpremeditated affair of Drumclog, still considered themselves entitled to retain their command, and without waiting for their brethren who afterwards joined them, they proceeded to state the grounds of their quarrel. Upon the arrival of the latter, a difference of opinion took place, which issued in a dispute that admitted of no accommodation. Hamilton and his adherents insisted that all the defections of church and state, and especially the acceptance of the indulgence, should be expressly condemned in the declaration which they intended to publish. (*Informatory Vindication*, p. 7. *Hind Let Loose*, p. 140.) This was opposed by many who had joined them since the skirmish at Drumclog, who pointed out the impropriety of such a measure at that time, as tending to prevent others from joining them who were friendly to Presbytery, and proposed that the determination of this point should be reserved to a free General Assembly.

When the cause of their assembling and continuing in arms came to be debated at a

meeting of their officers, which they called a “council of war,” Hamilton and several others were desirous of framing their declaration agreeably to that which had been published at Rutherglen. The other party, again, contended that the king’s authority ought to be expressly owned, according to the third article of the solemn league and covenant. This was opposed by Hamilton, who argued that “though they made no declaration *against* the king, yet considering what he had done against the interest of Christ, they ought not to make any positive declaration *for* him.” The opponents of Hanilton prevailed, however, so far as to obtain the publication of a paper at Glasgow on the 13th of June, entitled the “Hamilton Declaration,” in which the points contended against by the other side were inserted. But this measure only added fuel to the flame, and threatened to break up the camp, and entail ruin on the whole army.

Although there were no indulged ministers in the camp, (Howie’s Collection, Preface, p. 5,) yet Hamilton and his adherents accused Mr. Welsh, and those who took the more liberal side, of approving of the indulgence, and inclining to Erastianism. (Wil-

son's Relation, p. 5. Faithful Contendings, p. 191.) Among eighteen ministers who were present, two only, namely, Messrs. Thomas Douglas and Donald Cargill, defended the sentiments of Hamilton;\* and though they and their adherents certainly acted the more consistent part, yet in the present state of affairs their unbending tenaciousness was most unwise. It weakened the hands of the little army, split them into parties, and materially reduced their numbers. The leaders continued their lamentable dissensions till the advance of the king's army, thus wasting in strife and recrimination the precious time which they ought to have devoted to active preparation for the contest.

The request of the privy council for reinforcements from England having been immediately granted by Charles, the Duke of Monmouth, as commander-in-chief, arrived with a reinforcement of English troops at Edinburgh on the 18th of June, and next day marched westward, and joined the army at Kirkhillpark, which with the new auxili-

\* Wilson adds Messrs. King and Kid, but it seems evident that they acquiesced in the views taken by Mr Welsh.

aries, now amounted to about ten thousand men. His advance to Hamilton was slow; for though Lauderdale and the prelates had procured instructions to be sent after him, ordering him not to treat with, but to destroy, the Presbyterians, he was desirous of affording them time to tender their submission. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 821) Their friends in Edinburgh, and the greater part of their own leaders, were also extremely anxious to come to an accommodation. But Hamilton and his party being dissatisfied with the proposals which were drawn up, these were not presented to the duke till the engagement was commenced.

The king's army came within sight on Saturday the 21st, and encamped in Bothwell moor; the Covenanters' army lay on the south side of the Clyde in a moor near Hamilton. The river was not fordable for a considerable way up, and the narrow bridge at Bothwell was in possession of the Presbyterians. Early on Sabbath morning, the 22d, a sharp skirmish took place between the guard at the bridge and a detachment of the royal forces; but at the request of the Covenanters a cessation took place, and messengers were permitted to go over and lay

their supplication before Monmouth. The duke at first seemed inclined to favour them; but at the instigation of several Scottish noblemen, (Blackader's Mem., p. 245,) he dismissed the messengers with the following answer: "That he would not treat with them till they laid down their arms and submitted to the king's mercy."\* Half an hour was allowed for the return of an answer; but scarcely had the messengers reached the bridge before the royal army advanced. The party who guarded the bridge defended it with the greatest resolution and bravery for upwards of two hours, during which time the duke's forces were twice repulsed, and even driven from their cannon, which that determined little band would have seized had they been suitably supported. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 106. Ure's Narrative.) At length, upon the failure of their ammunition, they despatched a messenger to Hamilton, requesting him either to furnish them with a new supply, or send to their assistance a fresh detachment of troops.† But to their

\* When this answer was conveyed to Hamilton, he replied,—“and hang next.” Ure's Narrative.

† Wilson's Relation, p. 37.—It ought to be stated as some extenuation of Hamilton's conduct, that on opening a barrel of gunpowder, which had been ordered from a

astonishment, Hamilton, most ungeneral-like, ordered them to leave the bridge and fall back on the main body of the army.

No sooner was this unwise and fatal order given, and the bridge abandoned, than the king's troops marched over and attacked the Covenanters. The whole west country army was immediately thrown into confusion, and in a few minutes completely routed. The murderous scene which followed was truly dismal, the military putting to death every one without distinction who fell into their hands. Four hundred were left dead on the field on that fatal day, and twelve hundred taken prisoners, among whom were Messrs. King and Kid. The slaughter would have been much greater had not the humanity of the duke far exceeded that of the inferior officers. Many who had no concern in the rising were murdered in cold blood on the public roads; nay, Claverhouse inhumanly proposed to kill the prisoners, burn Glasgow and Hamilton, and destroy the surrounding country; but this horrid proposal was indignantly rejected by Monmouth.\* “ Yet though

merchant in Hamilton, it proved to be a barrel of *raisins!* Whether this originated from treachery or mistake, could be never ascertained. Blackader's Mem., p. 244.

\* Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 112. Burnet, vol. ii. p. 822.—

the retreat was sounded, Claverhouse and the English dragoons were so cruelly set for blood and murder, that they could not be restrained, till they were compelled by force of some parties sent out by the duke for that purpose." (Blackader's Mem. p. 248.)

Thus terminated a contest which, by the majority of historians, has been branded with the name of a *rebellion*. But if the covenanters at Bothwell, in taking up arms to defend themselves against intolerable oppression, and to assert their just liberties, were guilty of rebellion, so were the parliaments of both kingdoms at the Revolution. These unsuccessful patriots are also condemned for having admitted into their army several of the assassins of Archbishop Sharpe: but it is satisfactorily proved that till the battle of Bothwell it was not generally known that they were in the camp; even Mr. King was ignorant that Burley and Rathillet were accessory to the commission of that deed.

Notwithstanding the humanity of the commander, the inferior officers treated the pri-

The last author adds, that when Monmouth returned to London, the king told him, that if he had been at Bothwell, "they should not have had the trouble of prisoners!"

soners with the most wanton barbarity. They were stripped almost naked, and ordered to lie flat on the ground, while those who lifted up their heads to implore a little water were shot dead on the spot. Being tied two and two together, they were then driven to Edinburgh like a flock of cattle, and exposed to sufferings at which humanity recoils. Even a cup of cold water to quench their thirst was denied them, and when some sympathizing females attempted to give them a little refreshment, the brutal soldiery trampled the provisions beneath their feet, and poured the water on the ground. In this truly pitiable condition the prisoners entered Edinburgh, and were confined in the Greyfriars' churchyard, without any shelter, under a strong guard.

In the meanwhile Claverhouse and the military oppressed the west country in the most cruel manner. Fines, tortures, and murders, without any discrimination, marked the track of that champion for tyranny. To enter into a detail of his barbarities would display a scene no less revolting than dismal: for if the simple lending of a plough to a man who was *suspected* to have been at Bothwell furnished this *hero* with an excuse

for robbing the lender of his little all, (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 122,) what must have been the lot of those whom he chose to accuse of *higher offences*? Passing, therefore, at present, the ravages and cruelties which he committed in Ayrshire and Galloway, we shall now revert to the proceedings of the council.

A proclamation was issued by the council on the 26th June, against those who had escaped at Bothwell, which though unreasonably severe, might be expected as a matter of course ; but their prohibiting “all subjects, whether men or women, from harbouring, resetting, supplying, corresponding with, or concealing any of the rebels,” and declaring, “their failing to pursue all such as the worst of traitors,” to be an evidence that they themselves were “accessory to the rebel lion,” displayed a spirit of tyranny nothing behind that evinced by the most despotic government that ever existed on the face of the earth. It is true that a kind of a short-lived indemnity and indulgence was published in the month of July ; but the former excluded all Covenanters, and the latter was scarcely issued when it was recalled. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 823.)

On the 4th of July the council received a letter from Charles, giving them directions regarding the disposal of the prisoners. In this letter his majesty says, " We do require you to try out for such among all the prisoners as can most probably discover the rise and occasion of this rebellion, the means by which it was carried on, &c. For discovering of all which, we do ordain you to offer them our royal pardon, if they discover and make out their information, and that you put them to the torture if they refuse to inform in what you have pregnant presumptions to believe they know. When this is done, we do in the next place approve the motion made by you, of sending three or four hundred of these prisoners to the plantations, for which we authorize you to grant a warrant in order to their transportation. It is likewise our pleasure that you cause prosecute as traitors immediately, the heritors, ministers, and ringleaders of this rebellion, those only excepted who shall discover in manner above related." (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 116.) Agreeably to this letter the council drew up the following bond, which they presented to a number of the prisoners: " I, being apprehended for being at the late *rebel-*

*lion, and whereas the lords of his majesty's privy council, in pursuance of his majesty's command, have ordained me to be set at liberty, I enacting myself to the effect under written ; therefore I bind, oblige, and enact myself, in the books of the privy council, that hereafter I shall not take up arms without or against his majesty or his authority."* This bond, which required the subscribers to acknowledge the rising at Bothwell to be rebellion, and prohibited them from defending themselves by arms, notwithstanding the sufferings to which they might unjustly be exposed, was rejected by a great number of the prisoners. Many of those who subscribed it were liberated only to endure greater miseries from the lawless military, while others of them were detained in confinement, to be banished to the plantations along with those who steadfastly refused to purchase their freedom at the expense of their conscience. (Hind Let Loose, p. 142.)

But the resolution of the council to transport as slaves a great number of the prisoners was not sufficient. Seven of them were selected for trial with the previous determination of putting them to death. Of these Messrs. Kid and King were the first who

were condemned. Having been examined as to the origin of the rising, and their answers not being deemed satisfactory, they were first put to the torture, and then indicted before the judiciary court, "for having been in the rebellion and preaching at field conventicles." Their request to be permitted to adduce an exculpatory proof was refused, and they were condemned—on no other evidence than their own confession extorted by the torture—to be executed on the 14th of August. As if to mock the people, that day had been fixed upon to proclaim an indemnity, not for the Presbyterians, but for their persecutors.\* This ceremony being finished with great pomp, the two martyrs were brought forth, and executed agreeably to their sentence, their heads and their right hands being cut off and fixed

\* That this indemnity was chiefly intended to screen Lauderdale and his friends is evident from the defences of Hatton against whom a process was raised in 1682 for malversations as late general of the mint. In these defences it was pleaded that he was discharged and pardoned by the general indemnity; for "this oblivion and indemnity in 1679 is more ample than any of them, being drawn in the most ample and comprehensive terms deviseable, as mainly designed to secure Lauderdale and his party for the Highland army that they sent in upon the west in 1678, &c. and the pardoning the rebels who rose at Bothwell Bridge, was but a sham and colour to draw on the other."—Fountainhall's Decisions, i. p. 208.

on the Netherbow port. In his dying speech on the scaffold, Mr. Kid said, “For personal presence with that party whom they called *rebels*, for my part I never judged them or called them such. I acknowledge there were a great many there who came in the simplicity of their hearts; and I am sure, on the other hand, there was a great party there that had nothing before them but repairing of the Lord’s fallen down work, and restoring of the breach which is wide as the sea. But for rebellion against his majesty’s person or lawful authority, the Lord knows my soul abhorreth it. I have lived in the faith of this, that the three kingdoms are married lands; and I die in the faith of it, that there will be a resurrection of his name, word, cause, covenants, and of all his interests therein: though I dare not determine the time when, or the manner how.” Mr. King having expressed himself to the same purpose, concluded his speech in the following affecting manner: “Now I bid farewell to all my friends and dear relations; farewell my poor wife and child, whom I leave on the good hand of him who is better than seven husbands, and will be a father to the fatherless. Farewell all creature-comforts,

and welcome everlasting life, everlasting glory, everlasting love, and everlasting praise.” (Naphtali, p. 455, et seq.)

The other five prisoners who were selected to suffer death, not so much on account of their being present at Bothwell, as on pretence that they approved of the bishop’s assassination, were Thomas Brown, Andrew Sword, John Clyde, James Wood, and John Waddel. It was not even so much as alleged that they had any hand in the archbishop’s death; but having refused when called upon to declare it to be *murder*, and acknowledging that they were at Bothwell, they were condemned to be executed at Magus-moor, for the purpose of marking “the king’s detestation” of the deed which was there committed. The following are the exact words of their sentence:—“That they be carried to the moor of Magus, in the sheriffdom of Fife, the place where his grace the archbishop of St. Andrews was murdered, upon the 18th of November instant, and there to be hanged till they be dead, and their bodies to be hung in chains till they rot, and all their lands, goods, and gear, to fall to his majesty’s use.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 140.) Four of them had never been in Fife, nor had ever seen a

bishop to their knowledge ; and James Wood, though at Bothwell, had no arms on that fatal day.

Agreeably to their sentence, they were executed at Magus-moor on the 25th of November, leaving a joint as well as an individual testimony to the cause for which they suffered. When on the scaffold they addressed the spectators in the following language : “ We desire you all not to cast a reproach on that late appearing at Bothwell bridge, lest ye state God an enemy against you, for we bless him, that ever he fell upon such a method with the like of us, as to make us appear for so honourable a cause as that. We give our joint witness and testimony against Popery, Prelacy, and all other corruptions in these loose times, particularly against bishops, curates, and malignants, and all who connive with them in that black course they are in for the present, and strengthen the hands of the adversary in carrying on a course of defection. We give our testimony against that calumny cast upon Presbyterians, that they are not loyal to their king, which aspersion as false we abhor ; so we desire you to obey your king in all his lawful commands, according as ye are bound in the word of God and

your covenants; but when God's laws and the king's laws are contrary one to another, do not stretch your consciences for the sake of your life. Likewise we give our testimony against the taking of unlawful bonds or declarations for the saving of the life, for which cause we come here to lay down our lives, even for refusing to take such bonds; we bless the Lord who hath kept us free from these things, and we hope to praise him through all eternity." (Naphtali, pp. 535, 536. *Scots Worthies*, p. 241.)

We have already seen the decided part which many of the prisoners in the Grey-friars' Church-yard acted in regard to the bond. Though urged to subscribe it by the ministers of Edinburgh, they decidedly refused; and after suffering for five months innumerable hardships, the greater part of them were ordered to be transported to Barbadoes and sold for slaves. On the 15th of November, accordingly, two hundred and fifty of these prisoners, among whom were several that had subscribed the bond, were put on board a vessel lying in Leith Roads. Here they remained lying at anchor for twelve days, during which time they were treated with the greatest cruelty. They were stowed

between decks like so many cattle, in a space hardly capable of containing a third part of them; and to add to their miseries, though nearly suffocated, they were denied a little air or a draught of cold water to allay the fever of thirst with which they were tormented. “All the trouble they met with before Bothwell,” says one of the sufferers in a letter from the ship to his wife, “was not to be compared to one day in their present circumstances; their uneasiness was beyond words; yet he owned in very pathetical terms, that the consolations of God overbalanced all, and expressed his hopes that they were near their port, and heaven open for them.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 131.) Having sailed on the 27th, they with difficulty arrived at the Orkneys on the 10th of December, where they were overtaken by a fearful tempest. The barbarous captain, who by the bye was a papist, immediately ordered the hatches to be nailed down, lest any of the prisoners should escape; and in the course of the night, the ship having struck upon a rock, he and the crew provided for their own safety, regardless of the heart-rending cries of the prisoners, who besought him in vain to order the hatches to be opened.

One of the seamen more humane than his fellows, at the risk of his life, returned to the ship, and with an axe cut a hole in the deck, by means of which about fifty escaped, but the remainder, amounting to two hundred persons, sunk to the bottom in the vessel, from which they had been so cruelly deprived of the means of escape ! (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 37. Hind Let Loose, p. 142.)

That so foul a murder was suffered to pass with impunity can excite no surprise, seeing it was only a more summary method than that pursued by the government for getting rid of the Covenanters.\* Nay the fate of these prisoners was enviable compared with that of their brethren whom they had left behind them ; for while the former were now beyond the reach of their enemies, the latter were suffered to return home, only to be plundered, robbed and tortured anew by a lawless military.

In all these oppressions, Claverhouse and his troops acted a conspicuous part. The country was now parcelled out into lots consisting of from one to three parishes, in each

\* The captain, instead of being called to account for the barbarous murder of so many individuals, was afterwards indemnified for the loss which he had sustained by the wreck.

of which the movables of those who had been at Bothwell were conferred on individuals among the nobility and military. Claverhouse of course was rewarded with a large district, which he plundered with the greatest rapacity, robbing of their property, not only the individuals who had taken up arms against tyranny, but all whom he suspected of entertaining for them the smallest favour. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 121.)

In order still further to facilitate the ruin of the Presbyterians in the west country, circuit courts were appointed, with powers "to prosecute with the utmost rigour, all suppliers, intercommuners or corresponders with the rebels who had been at Bothwell," and to forfeit and burn in effigy those who did not appear upon citation. The clerks of court were ordered to make preparations for the trial of delinquents, by taking up the names of all who were suspected of being connected with the rising or resorting to field conventicles, and to give in a minute account of their property and effects to the court. These lists, which were entitled the "Porteous-rolls," were filled with the names not only of such as had been at Bothwell, but with those of multitudes who had no con-

cern whatever with that affair. The chief informers were the curates, who suffered almost none of the Presbyterians to escape, but gave up to the clerks the names of all who had evinced the smallest dislike to Prelacy. The rolls were consequently soon filled, and no name was permitted to be erased, however satisfactorily the accused might establish his innocence, unless he satisfied the informers by a composition little short of all that he possessed.

The circuit courts were opened with great solemnity at Glasgow, Ayr, Wigton, and Dumfries; and the witnesses and juries having been previously summoned to attend, their lordships proceeded to examine the cases of delinquents, according to the rolls. All who did not appear were denounced as fugitives; many of them were forfeited, and their estates conferred on gentlemen or officers in the army. Such heritors as obeyed the citation were imprisoned, and those among the common people who subscribed the bond when presented to them, were for the present dismissed. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 145.)

During these arbitrary and disgraceful proceedings the council received information

that the Duke of York intended to visit Scotland. Great preparations were consequently made for the reception of that bigoted papist; and on the 24th of November he entered Edinburgh with great pomp, and was splendidly entertained at the expense of the city. He was immediately admitted a member of the privy council, without taking the oaths, his majesty having commanded him to be exempted as being so nearly allied to royalty. Although the Duke, from political motives, did not, during this short visit, appear as an open persecutor of the Presbyterians, yet at his instigation the council proceeded with redoubled vigour in the work of oppression, and new plans were formed for still greater cruelties to be afterwards inflicted.

The flattering reception of the Duke of York justly alarmed the Covenanters, who trembled for the advancement of a Popish successor to the throne. As a specimen of the ardent and enthusiastic love of civil liberty, combined with zeal for the Protestant religion, which inflamed their breasts, we shall make the following quotation from a letter written from the continent at this period by Mr. M'Ward to his brethren in Scotland, in whose sentiments they in general cordially

acquiesced. “ I cannot hide it from you, that I would have been less troubled if I had heard that he had marched down to Scotland with an army, made up of his English, French, and Irish papists, and all the men of that kidney, soul, and complexion, which are associate to burn, slay, and destroy that poor church and nation, because of their declared detestation at his abominations and idolatry, to the erection whereof he resolves to sacrifice the lives of all the lovers of our Lord Jesus Christ in the three kingdoms, and of the patriots of their country, who witness that they cannot outlive the departing of the glory, nor give up the interest of Christ, together with the liberty of the nation, to the lust of so publicly declared an enemy to both ; than to have heard that by this very deed, we have declared our abominable baseness in the sight of God, angels, and men. Alas ! whither have we not caused our shame to go ? Alas ! where is the Lord God of Elijah ? Oh ! where is the spirit of our noble ancestors, zealous for the Lord God of Hosts ? Alas ! where are the Knoxes ? &c.—I shall not trouble you with the stories of all that horror, hatred, and shaking of head, wherewith his account is en-tertained abroad, amongst

all that are so much Christians, as to give the just preference to religion, or so much men, as to love the liberty of their nation; and would rather die in the quarrel ere they saw and suffered themselves to be robbed of that precious treasure of religion, and together with that, to outlive the loss of their liberty—and so only to live—to breathe at least under the yoke of antichristian bondage; and at length breathe out their miserable lives, under the bitterness, anguish, and agony, arising from the reproachings of their own conscience, that they had been so much beasts, as to entail slavery on their posterity—and so go to the grave, as the most miserable captives, under the curse of the children not yet born. Nor shall I entertain you with the account of that just discountenance and disrespect wherewith he was entertained in the United Provinces—insomuch as, all the time he was there, the people were so incensed at him, as an enemy to pure religion and true liberty, that his name was not so much as put in the public courants, lest, if it had, both pens and tongues had taken a just liberty and freedom to regret his having so much countenance or regard. And what may the United Provinces think of us, when

their courants shall be filled with the stories of this solemn and sumptuous reception, appointed for welcoming such a declared enemy to religion and liberty, as if he were, for his affection to both, the very darling and delight of the nation? Surely they will bless themselves, that they are not yet degenerate so far as we are; who, in this, seem to have forgotten we have souls, and are so much beasts, as, with the faces of men, we can bow our neck to the yoke of bondage, and glory in being so base. But it concerns us much more to think, and seriously to weigh, what England will judge of the solemnity of this reception; when, from the one end of that nation to the other, their public gazettes shall set before their eyes our shame, and the matter of their grief and sorrow. What shall these true patriots, who then withstood the court-contrivances, while under so many disadvantages, now think of us? What shall these nobles who with so much greatness and grandeur of spirit, did not only own the Protestant religion (while they saw the design discovered of destroying it,) by displaying openly a banner for truth in face of parliament; but were pleased, in a high, heroic freedom, which will make them famous to

posterity, to concern themselves, even in the preservation thereof in Scotland, France, and Ireland, as well as in England? I say, what judgment shall they give of us?" M'Ward's *παγωνισμοι*, p. 332, et seq.)



## CHAPTER II.

Justiciary commissions appointed—proceedings of the circuit courts and the military—Mr. Cargill and Henry Hall, of Haughhead, seized at the Queensferry—Cargill escapes—death of Hall—declaration found on him—it is disowned by the Covenanters—they publish a declaration and testimony at Sanquhar—efforts of the council to apprehend those concerned—bond of mutual defence agreed upon by Cameron and others—sufferings of the indulged—skirmish at Airsmoss—death of Cameron—cruel treatment of Hackston, of Rathillet—his horrid sentence and execution—Archibald Alison and John Malcolm put to death—Mr. Cargill excommunicates the king, &c., at Torwood—the Duke of York again visits Scotland—Messrs. Skene, Stewart and Potter condemned and executed—students burn the pope's effigy.

THE violent proceedings of the council and military against the Covenanters during the year 1679, were fearfully increased in 1680. Taking advantage of an obsolete law, which required all the subjects, on any emergency, to attend the king's army, the council resolved to impose exorbitant fines on those heritors who had not appeared against the Presbyterians at Bothwell. Avarice alone dictated

this resolution, which was so illegal, that several of the members themselves were shocked at it; but it was carried by a majority; and hundreds of heritors and free-holders were cited before the justiciary court. No excuse, however reasonable, was received, and fines, amounting in some cases, to six thousand pounds Scots, were extorted from the offenders. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 179.) Many were fined in absence, and warrants issued for their forfeiture. Commissions were at the same time granted to Glencairn, Dalzell, Queensberry, Claverhouse, and others, to search for, and apprehend all those heritors who had countenanced the late rising.

Although field conventicles were now nearly suppressed—Messrs. Cargill, Cameron, and a few other ministers being the only individuals who ventured to hazard their lives in order to proclaim the glad tidings of mercy to their persecuted countrymen—new proclamations continued to be issued against these obnoxious meetings. The council were unsatisfied while *one* convention remained in the country. They accordingly wrote to Lauderdale on the 8th of April, requesting that—seeing the lords of justiciary were so much engaged in prosecuting the heritors and

ministers who were in the rebellion, and the absentees from the king's host—justiciary commissions might be granted to certain individuals to punish those who frequented field conventicles. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 41.) With this letter the following articles, against "those persons understood to be the king's enemies," were transmitted to court for the sanction of his majesty, namely, that the king's forces be empowered to attack and kill, in case of resistance, all who were forfeited by the parliament or the criminal court, all heritors and ministers who had been in the rebellion; such heritors as approved of it; all rebels who had not taken the bond; all who, though they had taken the bond had been at field conventicles since the 27th July last year; all who had done violence to the orthodox clergy; and especially the murderers of the bishop of St. Andrews. These propositions, together with another for additional garrisons, being cheerfully acceded to by Charles, were immediately carried into effect by the council, and became the cause of increased oppressions throughout the country. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 184.)

While the council were thus employed, the circuit courts of the west country, and the

military were greedily plundering the Presbyterians of whatever little property they yet retained. It was no excuse that an individual was unconnected in any manner with the rising at Bothwell. Claverhouse and his troops overran one parish after another, plundering without discrimination every house pointed out by the curates, and searching for those fugitive heritors whose names appeared on the porteous-rolls. Nor did the few who wounded their consciences by admitting the rising at Bothwell to be rebellion, and engaging never to attend a conventicle, escape the rapacity of the military, any more than those who, rather than submit, abandoned their homes, and became wanderers on the mountains. All were persecuted in one form or another, it being sufficient that the sufferer bore the name of a Presbyterian. (*Hind Let Loose*, p. 143.) "I find," says Wodrow, "that Claverhouse had a commission from the council, to uplift the movables of all such in the shire and stewartry of Galloway as had been at Bothwell, or were fugitare. His brother, Cornet Graham, was employed by him; and by himself, or some deputed by him, he went through every parish there, and prosecuted his business with the utmost

severity. It was by this commission granted to Claverhouse and his assignees, as we have seen, courts were held this year by Cornet Graham in the south, and inquiry was made into all the branches of non-conformity, as well as queries put with relation to Bothwell. There was a court held at New Galloway by the Cornet, at which all between sixty and sixteen were charged to appear, under the severest penalties, and declare upon oath how many conventicles they had been at, who preached, and whom they knew present, what children were baptized, &c. This was unreasonable, illegal, and a heavy temptation to perjury. (Hist., vol. iii. p. 191.)

But while the Covenanters in general were thus cruelly persecuted, the party who so zealously opposed the indulgence previous to the battle of Bothwell—having separated from their brethren both indulged and non-indulged—were particularly obnoxious to the council and prelates. Their ministers were now reduced to two, namely, Cameron and Cargill, who, though they sometimes suffered their zeal to outstrip their prudence, were evidently the more consistent adherents to the original principles of the Covenanters. That they were the only Covenanters at that

period, we cannot, however, admit; and while we would beware of being misled by the partial statements of Wodrow concerning these conscientious and intrepid Presbyterians, we would no less avoid implicitly following the accounts of those writers who have devoted themselves entirely to their party.

Being exposed to greater persecution, it was natural that the followers of Cameron should more minutely inquire into the reciprocal duties of rulers and subjects. Their inquiries, accordingly, aided not a little by their sufferings, led them to conclude, that when rulers wantonly violate their solemn engagements with their subjects and become tyrants, the people are loosed from theirs, and are no longer bound to support and defend those by whom they are oppressed. It is not likely, however, that they would have published these sentiments to the world as early as they did, had not a circumstance occurred which rendered it necessary for them to make an explicit statement of their principles.

While Mr. Cargill and Henry Hall of Haughhead were lurking in the neighbourhood of Borrowstounness and the Queens-

ferry, they were surprised at the latter place, on 3d of June, by the governor of Blackness castle, upon the information of the curates of Borrowstouness and Caridden. Through the intrepidity of Hall, who was mortally wounded in the scuffle, Cargill made his escape ; but Hall was seized, and ordered to be conveyed to Edinburgh. He expired, however, on the road ; and on his person was found the unfinished scroll of a declaration, which was immediately transmitted to the council. In this unauthenticated draught, the following sentiments are expressed :—“ We believe that the doctrine contained in the Scriptures, summed up in our confessions of faith, and engaged to us in our covenants, is the only true doctrine of God : we shall endeavour, to our utmost, the overthrow of the kingdom of darkness, and whatever is contrary to the kingdom of Christ, especially idolatry, popery, superstition, will-worship, Prelacy, and Erastianism. Seriously considering that the hand of our kings, and rulers with them, hath been a long time against the throne of the Lord, the power and purity of our religion, and Christ’s reigning over his church, disclaiming the covenants with God, governing contrary to all laws divine and

human, and to all the ends of governments &c.—we do reject that king, and those associates with him in the government, from being our king and rulers, they having altered and destroyed the Lord's established religion, overturned the fundamental and established laws of the kingdom, and changed the civil government into tyranny. We do declare that we shall set up over ourselves, and over what God shall give us power of, government and governors according to the word of God, and especially that word, Exod. xviii. 21, that we shall no more commit the government to any one single person, or lineal successor, we not being, as the Jews were, bound to one single family, that kind being liable to most inconveniences, and aptest to degenerate into tyranny. Moreover, we declare that those men, whom we shall set over us, shall be engaged to govern us, principally by that civil and judicial law (not that which is ceremonial or typical) given by God to his people of Israel.” (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 375.) It can be no matter of surprise that the writer of this declaration renounced the king’s authority, but the bold avowal in it to alter the form of government—which was so opposed to the senti-

ments of the most rigid Covenanters—proves that the author alone was responsible for its contents. It was indeed disowned by the followers of Cameron. The council, however, thought proper to publish it, charging the whole party with the intention of changing the government of the country, and of involving the nation in a civil war. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 212.)

To counteract the impression which this paper was calculated to make on the public mind, Cargill, Cameron, and their adherents, resolved to publish an authenticated declaration and testimony, adhering to the present form of government, but renouncing allegiance to the tyrannical monarch. This document, of which it will be necessary to give the greater part, was affixed to the market cross of Sanquhar on the 22d of June, in consequence of which it received the title of the “Sanquhar Declaration.” It proceeds thus: “It is not amongst the smallest of the Lord’s mercies to this poor land, that there have always been some who have given their testimony against every course of defection we were guilty of; which is a token for good, that he doth not intend to cast us off altogether, but that he will leave a remnant, in

whom he will be gracious, if they through his grace keep themselves clean, and walk in his ways and methods, as they have been walked in and owned by predecessors of truly worthy memory, in their carrying on of our noble work of reformation, in the several steps thereof, both from Popery and Prelacy, and likewise from Erastian supremacy, so much usurped by him, who, it is true, (so far as we know,) is descended from the race of our kings, yet he hath so far departed from what he ought to have been, by his perjury, and usurping in church matters, and tyranny in matters civil, as is known by the whole land ; that we have just reason to account it amongst the Lord's great controversies against us, that we have not disowned him, and the men of his practices, whether inferior magistrates or any other, as enemies to our Lord Jesus's crown, and the true Protestant and Presbyterian interest in these lands, our Lord's espoused bride and church. Therefore, although we be for government and governors, such as the word of God, and our covenants allow ; yet we for ourselves and all that will adhere to us, the representatives of the true Presbyterian Church and Covenanted nation of Scotland, considering

the great hazard of lying under sin any longer, do by these presents disown Charles Stuart, who hath been reigning these years bygone (or rather we may say tyrannizing) on the throne of Britain, as having any right, title, or interest to or in the said crown of Scotland or government, as forfeited several years since by his perjury and breach of covenant with God and his church, and usurpation of his crown and royal prerogative, and many other breaches in matters ecclesiastic, and by his tyranny and breaches in the very *leges regnandi* in matters civil. As also we, under the banner of our Lord Jesus Christ, the captain of salvation, do declare a war with such a tyrant and usurper, and all the men of these practices, as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ, and his cause and covenant, and against all such as have any way strengthened him, sided with, or acknowledged him in his usurpation, civil and ecclesiastic. As also we disown and resent the reception of the Duke of York, a professed papist, as repugnant to our principles and vows to the Most High God, and as that which is the great, though, alas ! the just reproach of our church.” (Informatory Vindication, pp. 89—91.)

This declaration has most unwarrantably

been stigmatized with every epithet that is execrable; but are not the principles which it avows, in substance the same with those which in 1688 were acted upon by both parliaments, when the race of Stuart was for ever banished from the throne? To the comparatively few, but intrepid patriots who thus boldly set at defiance the doctrine of passive obedience to despots, the British Isles are at this day under no trifling debt of gratitude: They did “what they could;” and though their efforts were at that time unsuccessful, they proved the means of keeping alive that spark, which in eight years afterwards burst into a flame that defied the power of government to quench.

No sooner did the council receive intelligence of the publication of this paper, than they issued a proclamation, offering a reward for the apprehension of all concerned. Cargill, Cameron, and other ten individuals were declared traitors, and not only was a price set on their heads, but the heritors, bailies, &c. in sixteen different parishes, were enjoined “to cause cite before them in a court, all persons living upon their respective lands, men or women, above the age of sixteen years—and to take the *oaths* of the said per-

sons, whether any of these traitorsforesaid were in that parish, and where and when." Orders were at the same time given to Dal-yell and the other officers, to apprehend every disaffected individual, and send him under a guard to Edinburgh.

Perceiving the determination of the council to accomplish their destruction, Mr. Cameron, his brother, and about thirty others entered into the following bond of mutual defence:—"We undersubscribers bind and oblige ourselves to be faithful to God, and true to one another, and to all others who shall join with us in adhering to the Ruther-glen testimony, and disclaiming the Hamilton declaration, chiefly because it takes in the king's interest, which we are loosed from by reason of his perfidy and covenant-breaking, both to the most High God, and the people over whom he was set, on the terms of his propagating the main ends of the covenants, namely, the reformation of religion; and instead of that, usurping to himself the royal prerogatives of Jesus Christ, and encroaching upon the liberties of the church; and so stating himself in opposition to Jesus Christ, the Mediator, and the free govern-  
ment of his house: And also in disowning

and protesting against the reception of the Duke of York, a professed papist, and whatever else hath been done in this land (given to the Lord) in prejudice of our covenanted, and universally sworn to reformation. And although, as the Lord, who searcheth the heart, knows, we be for government and governors, both civil and ecclesiastic, such as the word of God and our covenants allow, yet by this we disown the present magistrates, who openly and avowedly are doing what in them lies for destroying utterly our work of reformation from Popery, Prelacy, Erastianism, and other heresies and errors; and by this we declare also, that we are not any more to own ministers indulged, and such as drive a sinful union with them; nor are we to join any more in this public cause with ministers, or professors of any rank, that are guilty of the defections of this time, until they give satisfaction proportioned to the scandal and offence they have given.” (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 361.) This paper which was found on Mr. Cameron after the skirmish at Airsmoss, still further enraged the council, and furnished them with an additional excuse for increasing the persecution.

But though the vengeance of the council fell most heavily upon the adherents of Cameron, no true Presbyterian, whether indulged or non-indulged, escaped suffering in one form or another. Mr. Gilbert Rule, for example, having ventured to preach without the bounds of the parish of Prestonhaugh, where he was indulged, and also to preach and baptize children in St. Giles church, Edinburgh, was deprived of his indulgence, and sent to the Bass. Nay, the king wrote to the council on the 14th of May, giving them additional instructions regarding the indulged ministers, and intimating that he was resolved to continue the indulgence only *for some time longer*. In consequence of these instructions, the Presbyterian ministers were burdened with new restrictions, and a foundation was laid for the repeal of an indulgence which at first was granted only to serve a purpose. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 46.)

Among the non-indulged, again, who were persecuted for their attachment to Presbyterian principles, was Mr. Archibald Riddell, who, though he had abstained from preaching in the fields since the indemnity, was imprisoned for holding house conventicles,

where some of the people were without doors. When examined before the council, Mr. Riddell acknowledged the king's authority, and highly disapproved of the sentiments of Cameron and Cargill; yet, for refusing to give his oath, that he would never in time coming preach in the fields, he was sent to the Bass. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 197, et seq.)

If the most compliant among the Presbyterians were thus persecuted, what must have been the sufferings of those whom the military were enjoined to hunt out and destroy without even the shadow of a trial? To cut off all who had any hand in framing, or who refused to condemn the Sanquhar Declaration, was the chief and unwearied aim of the council. Orders to this effect had been transmitted to all the forces throughout the country; and while the military were obeying their sanguinary injunctions, Bruce of Earls-hall, with a large party of dragoons, surprised Mr. Richard Cameron and his brother, Hackston of Rathillet, and about sixty Covenanters, on the 22d of July, at Airsmoss, in the parish of Auchinleck. Perceiving the approach of their enemies, Cameron, after engaging in prayer, encouraged the little band

to stand on their defence. But though they fought with the greatest bravery, they were overpowered by numbers, and nine of the party were killed on the spot. Among the slain were Cameron and his brother, who fell gallantly fighting back to back. Cameron's head and hands were cut off and sent to Edinburgh, to be placed on some elevated place, according to the barbarous practice of the council. But with a refinement in cruelty, they were first carried to his father, in Edinburgh jail, who was insultingly asked if he knew them. The venerable man having taken them in his hands, and kissed them, with tears exclaimed, "I know them, I know them; they are my son's, my own dear son's; it is the Lord; good is the will of the Lord, who cannot wrong me nor mine, but has made goodness and mercy to follow us all our days."\*

\* Scots Worthies, p. 338.—The despised party of Covenanters who adhered to the principles of this godly but persecuted minister, were afterwards, by way of reproach, called *Cameronians*.

We need make no apology for the insertion of the following beautiful tributary verses to the memory of those who fell at Airsmoss, written by James Hislop, a native of the district where the skirmish took place. Although he composed them when only a shepherd boy, and had enjoyed few opportunities of improving his mind, such are the merits of the "Cameronian Dream." (the title which the author gives his verses,) that it has been frequently reprinted—but seldom correctly. The

Hackston of Rathillet, who was among the number of the prisoners, was carried wounded—  
following is copied from the Scots Magazine for February, 1821:—

### CAMERONIAN DREAM.

In a dream of the night I was wafted away,  
To the moorland of mist where the martyrs lay;  
Where Cameron's sword and his Bible are seen,  
Engraved on the stane where the heather grows green.

'T was a dream of those ages of darkness and blood,  
When the minister's name was the mountain and wood;  
When in Wellwood's dark moorlands the standard of  
Zion,  
All bloody and torn, 'mang the heather was lying.

It was morning, and summer's young sun, from the east,  
Lay in loving repose on the green mountain's breast.  
On Wardlaw, and Cairn-Table, the clear shining dew,  
Glistened sheen 'mang heath-bells and mountain flowers  
blue.

And far up in heaven in the white sunny cloud,  
The sang of the lark was melodious and loud,  
And in Glenmuir's wild solitudes lengthened and deep,  
Was the whistling of plovers and the bleating of sheep.

And Wellwood's sweet valley breathed music and  
gladness,  
The fresh meadow blooms hung in beauty and redness;  
Its daughters were happy to hail the returning,  
And drink the delights of green July's bright morning.

But ah! there were hearts cherished far other feelings,  
Illumed by the light of prophetic revealings,  
Who drank from the scenery of beauty but sorrow,  
For they knew that their blood would bedew it to-morrow.

'T was the few faithful ones who, with Cameron, were  
lying [crying;  
Concealed 'mang the mist, where the heath-sowl was

ed and bleeding to Dalyell at Lanark, who threatened to roast him because he did not

For the horsemen of Earlshall around them were hovering, [covering.

And their bridle-reins rung through the thin misty

Their faces grew pale, and their swords were unsheathed,  
But the vengeance that darkened their brows was unbreathed;

With eyes raised to Heaven, in meek resignation,  
They sung their last song to the God of Salvation,

The hills with the deep mournful music were ringing  
The curlieu and plover in concert were singing;  
But the melody died 'midst derision and laughter,  
As the hosts of ungodly rushed on to the slaughter.

Though in mist and in darkness and fire they were shrouded,

Yet the souls of the righteous stood calm and unclouded;  
Their dark eyes flashed lightning as proud and unbending  
They stood like the rock which the thunder is rending.

The muskets were flashing, the blue swords were gleaming

The helmets were cleft, and the red blood was streaming,  
The heavens grew dark, and the thunder was rolling,  
When in Wellwood's dark moorlands the mighty were falling!—

When the righteous had fallen, and the combat had ended

A chariot of fire through the dark cloud descended,  
The drivers were angels on horses of whiteness,  
And its burning wheels turned upon axles of brightness.

A seraph unfolded its doors bright and shining,  
All dazzling like gold of the seventh refining,  
And the souls that came forth out of great tribulation,  
Have mounted the chariot and steeds of salvation.

On the arch of the rainbow the chariot is gliding,  
Through the paths of the thunder the horsemen are riding.  
Glide swiftly, bright spirits, the prize is before ye,  
A crown never fading, a kingdom of glory!

return satisfactory answers to his questions. With three others prisoners, he was then conveyed to Edinburgh, and received by the magistrates at the foot of the Canongate, who had previously received from the council the following disgraceful orders concerning the prisoners :—“The magistrates of Edinburgh are appointed, as soon as the body of D. Hackston of Rathillet is brought to the Water Gate, to receive him, and mount him on a bare-backed horse, with his face to the horse’s tail, and his feet tied beneath his belly, and his hands flittered with ropes ; that the executioner, with head covered, and his coat, lead his horse up the street to the tolbooth, the said Hackston being bareheaded ; that the three other prisoners be conveyed on foot, bareheaded after him, with their hands tied to a goad of iron : ordain the said executioner to carry the head of Cameron upon a halbert, from the Water Gate to the council-house ; that no meat or drink be given to Hackston after he is in prison, but what is prepared in the master of the tolbooth his house, and given by him ; that none speak with him, or any letters be conveyed to him ; that the master of the tolbooth have a special care of his person, as he will be answerable life for life.”

(Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 221.) Being brought before the council in the afternoon, he refused to acknowledge their authority, or that of the king, though threatened with the torture, which the enfeebled state of his body alone prevented from being inflicted. He was then indicted to undergo the form of a trial before the judiciary court on the 30th; but on the day preceding, the council, anticipating the sentence of the court, determined that he should be put to death in the following inhuman manner:—"That his body be drawn backward on a hurdle to the cross of Edinburgh; that there be an high scaffold erected a little above the cross, where, in the first place, his right hand is to be struck off, and, after some time, his left hand: then he is to be hanged up and cut down alive, his bowels to be taken out, and his heart shown to the people by the hangman: then his heart and his bowels to be burned in a fire prepared for that purpose on the scaffold: that afterwards his head be cut off, and his body divided into four quarters: his head to be fixed on the Netherbow, one of his quarters, with both of his hands, to be affixed at St. Andrews, another quarter at Glasgow, a third at Leith, a fourth at Burntisland: that

none presume to be in mourning for him, or any coffin brought: that no person be suffered to be on the scaffold with him save the two bailies, the executioner, and his servant: that he be allowed to pray to Almighty God, but not to speak to the people: that the heads of Cameron and John Fowler be affixed on the Netherbow: that Hackston's and Cameron's heads be fixed on higher poles than the rest.”\* When brought before the court, he declined its authority; he was of course found guilty, and condemned to suffer death that very day, agreeably to the horrid manner determined on by the council. The sentence was accordingly executed on him to the very letter, which he endured with the greatest fortitude and Christian resignation. (Hind Let Loose, p. 211. Cloud of Witnesses, p. 55, et seq.)

Archibald Alison and John Malcolm, two other of the prisoners who were taken at Airsmoss, were condemned to be executed in the Grassmarket on the 11th of August. They both died “rejoicing that they were

\* Well might Wodrow add, that “these orders are so spiteful, inhuman, and barbarous, that I wonder how they were fallen upon by the managers, or what they could design by them.” Hist., vol. iii. p. 222.

counted worthy to suffer for the name of Christ." "I enter my protestation," said the former of these martyrs in his dying speech, "before the Judge of all, both living and dead, before whom I am to appear in a little time, against all the encroachments made upon the prerogatives of our Lord Jesus Christ, particularly against Popery, Quakerism, and Prelacy, and all their underlings and the joiners with them; and against all supremacy that is contrary to the word of God—against Erastianism—the indulgences, and the silence of watchmen at this day in not giving faithful warning. I also enter my protestation against all those who have declared themselves opposite to our Lord Jesus Christ, and have displayed a banner for Satan; not only tolerating but acting and committing all manner of abominations, and horrid cruelties in things civil and ecclesiastical."

John Malcolm having expressed similar sentiments, added, "All the troopers and dragoons in the three kingdoms will never get that fire of love that is kindled in the breasts of some in this country quenched. The fathers will be telling the children of it when they are old men, who are not taken away from the wrath that is coming on, to avenge

the quarrel of a broken covenant; they will be telling, that in the year 1680, there were as great days as there are now, (when there were prelates through these lands,) upon the mountains up and down this west. It was then that I got the seal of God upon my soul." (Cloud of Witnesses, pp. 73, 78. Scots Worthies, pp. 262, 268.)

Mr. Donald Cargill was now the only minister who ventured to preach in the fields; and though every moment in danger of his life, he travelled from place to place, making known to his oppressed countrymen "the truth as it is in Jesus." The tyranny, profaneness, and cruelty of the government had been already protested against; declarations had been framed, battles fought, and scaffolds dyed with blood, in the cause of the covenants and the work of reformation. But hitherto no ecclesiastical censure had been passed on those who had apostatized from their original principles. Mr. Cargill now stood alone; yet, conceiving that the want of his brethren's concurrence neither could "disable his authority," nor "lessen the duty," he resolved publicly to pass on the most eminent offenders the highest censure of the church. Accordingly, at a field-meet-

ing held at Torwood, in Stirlingshire, in the month of September, after lecturing from Ezek. xxi. 25—27, and preaching from 1 Cor. v. 13, he proceeded to pronounce the sentence of excommunication on the King, the Duke of York, &c. in the following terms.

“ I, being a minister of Jesus Christ, and having authority and power from him, do in his name and by his Spirit, excommunicate and cast out of the true church, and deliver up to Satan, Charles II. king, &c., and that upon the account of these wickednesses; 1st, For his high contempt of God, in regard that after he had acknowledged his own sins, his father’s sins, and his mother’s idolatry—he hath gone on more avowedly in these sins than all that went before him. 2d, For his great perjury, in regard that after he had twice at least solemnly subscribed that covenant, he did so presumptuously renounce, disown, and command it to be burnt. 3d, For his rescinding all the laws establishing that religion and reformation engaged unto in that covenant, and enacting laws contrary thereunto. 4th, For commanding armies to destroy the Lord’s people, who were standing in their own just defence. 5th, For being an enemy to, and persecutor of true

Protestants, and a favourer and helper of papists. 6th, For his granting remissions and pardons to murderers, which is in the power of no king to do, being expressly contrary to the law of God. And, 7th, For his adulteries, &c. and dissembling both with God and men.

“ By the same authority, and in the same name, I excommunicate, &c., James Duke of York, for his idolatry, and for setting up idolatry in Scotland to defile the Lord’s land, and for enticing and encouraging others to do so.

“ In the same name—I excommunicate James Duke of Monmouth, for coming into Scotland at his father’s unjust command, and leading armies against the Lord’s people, who were constrained to rise, being killed in and for the right worship of God, and for refusing that morning at Bothwell bridge, a cessation of arms, for hearing and redressing their injuries, wrongs, and oppressions.

“ Next I do, by the same authority—excommunicate John Duke of Lauderdale, for his dreadful blasphemy, especially that word to the prelate of St. Andrews, *Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool*; his atheistical scoffing at re

ligion ; his apostasy from the covenant and reformation, and his persecuting thereof, after he had been a professor, pleader, and presser thereof; for his perjury, adulteries, gaming on the Lord's day, and ordinary cursing." In a similar manner he pronounced the sentence on the Duke of Rothes, Sir George M'Kenzie, the king's advocate, and Thomas Dalyell of Binns. (Collection of Sermons, pp. 411—413. Hind Let Loose, p. 154. Cloud of Witnesses, p. 365.)

In order to vindicate himself from the aspersions which were heaped upon him in consequence of this singular transaction, Car-gill, on the succeeding Sabbath, publicly justified the part he had acted in the words following :—" I know I am and will be condemned by many for what I have done, in excommunicating those wicked men ; but condemn me who will, I know I am approved of God, and am persuaded that what I have done on earth is ratified in heaven ; for if ever I knew the mind of God, and was clear in my call to any piece of my generation-work, it is in that ; and I shall give you two signs whereby you may know I am in no delusion. 1st, If some of these men do not find that sentence binding upon them ere

they go off the stage, and be not obliged to confess it from their terror, and to the affrightment of others. 2d, If these men die the ordinary death of men, then God hath not spoken by me.” We leave the reader to form his own opinion both of the sentence and of its justification. It is, however, certain, that in consequence of this transaction, the Duke of Rothes in particular died under the greatest horror of mind, and that the last moments of the rest were embittered with the dread of its effects. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 62.)

The parliament of England having resolved to bring in a bill to exclude the Duke of York—a professed papist—from succeeding to the throne, the king, to avert the fury of the threatened storm, resolved to send him once more to Scotland. He accordingly arrived in that kingdom in the end of October, and was received by the prelates in the most flattering manner. So great, indeed, was their satisfaction at the appearance of a popish prince among them, that they immediately wrote to the king a congratulatory letter, in which they say, “That profound respect, and sincere kindness, sir, which we observe in your majesty’s subjects here, to

your royal brother, the Duke of Albany and York, assure us, that we want nothing but occasion to hazard for the royal family, these lives and fortunes which you have made so sweet and secure to us ! We are obliged, with all zeal and sincerity, to return to your sacred majesty our most humble and hearty thanks for securing the just natural descent of that royal family, which is the chief glory and only security of this kingdom !” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 239.) Thus plainly did the “orthodox” clergy, as the Scottish Episcopilians styled themselves, express their satisfaction at the prospect of a Roman Catholie being seated on the throne.

The apparent moderation which the duke evinced in his former visit, was now entirely laid aside. His arrival in Scotland was the signal for new and greater severities on the Presbyterians, which he not only encouraged, but took an active part in inflicting. James Skene, Archibald Stewart, Robert Hamilton, and John Spreul, having been apprehended in the month of September, were examined before the council. No crime could be laid to their charge ; but the Sanquhar declaration, the Torwood excommunication, &c., furnished sufficient matter to the persecutors for

ensnaring a prisoner by their jesuitical questions. Besides, a pretended plot against the duke's life had been got up, and all who adhered to the sentiments of Cameron and Cargill were most unjustly charged with holding the doctrine of private assassination. Messrs. Skene and Stewart were examined by torture, and having adhered to the Sanquhar Declaration and disowned the king's authority in matters ecclesiastical, they were indicted before the justiciary court, along with John Potter, farmer in Uphall, found guilty, and condemned to be executed on the 1st of December. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 95.)

Mr. Skene, in his dying testimony, after laying the guilt of shedding his blood on his persecutors, condemned the reception which had been given to the Duke of York, together with "every thing which had been done against the covenants and the work of reformation." Mr. Stewart, who was unjustly charged with the crime of approving of private assassination, expressed his sentiments in the following terms:—"However I and that suffering remnant be mistaken, in that they give out in their declaration that I said I would kill the king or any of his council, it is an untruth and forged calumny, to re-

proach the ways of God, more like themselves and their own principles, who have killed so many of the people of God, both in the fields and upon scaffolds, and us among the rest, to please that bloody tyrant Charles Stuart's brother, and to make men believe that we have been contriving a plot to murder them." "O I am sure," exclaimed John Potter, "that the blood that has been shed in the fields and on the scaffolds in Scotland for the cause and interest of Jesus Christ, will have a glorious crop in spite of devils and men; and I am sure the seed sown at Airsmoss will have as glorious a vintage as ever seed in Scotland had. (*Cloud of Witnesses. Scots Worthies.*) These martyrs, amidst the base and cruel annoyance of the beating of drums to disturb them in their last moments, with the greatest serenity bade adieu to all sublunary things, and died in the blessed hope of a glorious immortality.

The execution of these three professors was accompanied by a long and severe proclamation against Mr. Cargill and his adherents, in which they are accused of the crimes of "rebellion, treason, murder, assassination, and of carrying on a plot for killing the king, the Duke of York, the councillors, bishops, &c. ;

the testimonies and declarations given by the sufferers and the Torwood excommunication are commented upon, and their meaning perverted, and tortured to answer the purposes of the council; and a reward of five thousand merks is offered for the apprehension, dead or alive, of Mr. Cargill, three thousand for Mr. Douglass, and one thousand for each of the other “conspirators.” The principles laid to the charge of Cargill and the Covenanters—that they held it lawful to commit the crimes of murder or assassination—are so often repeated, that their very repetition is one proof among many that either the council themselves did not believe them, or that they were afraid the nation in general would justly treat them as falsehoods. That some of the sufferers did utter unguarded expressions we readily admit, and considering the barbarity with which they were used, it is matter of astonishment that language much more exceptionable was not wrung from them amidst the agonies they endured. But in the Sanquhar paper, the Torwood excommunication,\* and other public declarations of their

\* “I desire the impartial reader,” says the author of *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*, “to compare the Torwood excommunication with the memorials [to the

sentiments, no countenance whatever is given to the commission of any of these crimes. In their declaration of war in the first mentioned of these papers, "they only intended," according to Mr. Cargill's own explanation before the council, "to justify their killing any of the king's forces in their own defence, if assaulted, which otherwise might have been esteemed murder." The utmost, therefore, that can be advanced against them, is, that they considered it lawful for "individuals in some extraordinary cases, when called upon, to execute righteous judgment upon

Prince of Orange] and see if it be possible for any British Protestant, who owns the justice of the Revolution, to reflect upon the zeal of these people without blushing for himself and the whole nation, that they did not see and abhor the tyranny of those reigns sooner; then they had joined with those people instead of censuring their zeal; the Revolution had then been brought about without sovereign help at all; the Prince of Orange had then been called over, as peaceably as King George, to take possession of the crown; and the blood of near twenty thousand people, who were one way or other murdered and destroyed by that now abdicated race of tyrants, had been saved. What a shame is it to us, and how much to the honour of these persecuted people, that they could thus see the treachery and tyranny of those reigns, when we saw it not; or rather that they had so much honesty of principle, and obeyed so strictly the dictates of conscience, as to bear their testimony early, nobly, and gloriously, to the truth of God and the rights of their country, both civil and religious; while we all, though seeing the same things, yet betrayed the cause of liberty and religion, by a sinful silence and a dreadful cowardice."

notorious offenders who were placed beyond the reach of common law.” And even this sentiment, though held in theory, they in general were exceedingly careful not to reduce to practice, of which their uniform conduct and acknowledged writings bear ample testimony.

To prevent the spread of opinions which had the smallest tendency to condemn the tyrannical proceedings of the council and prelates, an act was passed on the 11th of November, “against seditious books,” and a general search was ordered to be made for the works following: “Naphtali; Jus regni apud Scotos, in English; Jus Populi Vindictatum; Reformed Bishop; and Calderwood’s History.” A bookseller of the name of John Calderwood was imprisoned for having several of these works in his possession; and all booksellers and stationers were ordered “to produce the lists of what books they imported from abroad, in order to have the approbation of one of the officers of state, or of the bishop of Edinburgh. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 64.)

While the council were thus trampling on the rights, both civil and sacred, of the Scottish nation, the English parliament endeavoured

to carry through both houses the bill for excluding the Duke of York from the throne. It was passed by the commons, but lost in the lords by a small majority, all the bishops except three voting against it; and shortly afterwards, Charles, incensed at these laudable efforts to preserve the liberties of the nation, first prorogued, and then dissolved the parliament. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 838.)

The aversion to popery manifested by the English patriots was, though in a different manner, partially evinced in Scotland. The students in the college of Edinburgh having accidentally seen an engraving representing the burning of the pope's effigy in London, resolved to perform the same ceremony publicly in Edinburgh. They accordingly clothed an image of the pope in pontifical robes, with his keys, mitre, and triple crown; and, on the 25th of December, after pronouncing on him the sentence of excommunication, seated him in a chair of state, and carried him up the Cowgate to the foot of Blackfriars' Wynd, preceded by several of their number bearing lighted torches. Aware of their intention, the magistrates ordered the military to prevent so gross an insult being committed on the duke's religion, and to

seize some of the most active of the youthful offenders. The students having given out that they intended to commit his Holiness to the flames at the usual place of execution in the Grass-market, the soldiers marched to the place appointed, and patiently waited for the appearance of the procession. But instead of proceeding forward, the students turned up Blackfriars' Wynd, and setting down the chair on the High Street, first gravely pronounced sentence on the sovereign pontiff, and then set fire to the effigy, which, having a quantity of gunpowder lodged in it, was immediately blown up. The day following, several of the leaders in this affair were imprisoned, and an act was passed by the council of the following tenor:—“Considering that bonds and combinations have been entered into by the students of the college, and several tumults raised thereupon in the city, and the government itself is defamed by them, ordain the magistrates of Edinburgh instantly to cause shut the college gates, and cause the classes be dissolved till further orders.” Great efforts were at the same time made to implicate the Covenanters, and especially the Presbyterian ministers in this riot, but these efforts failing, the affair was terminated by the council ordering

all the students to take the oath of allegiance. (Wodrow, vol. iii. pp. 345, 346.)

A similar spirit was evinced by the students in Glasgow, who, though they did not carry matters to so great a length as was done by those in Edinburgh, decorated themselves with the ribbons formerly used by the Covenanters. Several of them, among whom was the Marquis of Annandale, being called before the masters and the archbishop to answer for their conduct, Annandale defended himself and his companions with the greatest spirit, and refused to give the bishop any other title than Sir. Mr. Nicolson, his regent, reproved him for his incivility to the prelate, saying, “William, you do not understand whom you speak to, he is a greater person than yourself.” To which Annandale replied, “I know the king hath been pleased to make him a spiritual lord, but I know likewise that the piper of Arbroath’s son and my father’s son are not to be compared;”\* adding, that more noble blood flowed in his veins than in the whole fourteen of them put together.

\* Arthur Ross was the name of this bishop. Burnet says, “He was a poor, ignorant, and worthless man, but in whom obedience and fury were so eminent, that these supplied all other defects.”

## CHAPTER X.

Disgraceful conduct of Sir George M'Kenzie—trial and execution of Isabel Alison and Marion Harvey—outrages committed by the military—violent proceedings of Kennoway—examination of Mr. Blackader—barbarous treatment of Mr. Spreul—the Gibbites—apprehension of Mr. Donald Cargill—his trial and execution—other four Covenanters put to death—proceedings of parliament—act securing the succession—the test act—its contradictory nature—opposition to it throughout the kingdom—protest given to the Duke of York in Glasgow—trial of six Covenanters before the justiciary—five of them executed.

THAT the presence of the Duke of York gave renewed vigour to the council in carrying on their deeds of oppression and blood, will appear but too evident from the following brief account of the year 1681. The justiciary was literally a court of injustice and cruelty, entirely under the control, and subservient to the will of the tyrants; and Sir George M'Kenzie, the king's advocate—whose name will be detested in every age—seemed to delight in nothing but shedding the blood of the innocent. The summoning of a jury was a mere farce, for whatever their opinion might be concerning the guilt or the innocence of a prisoner, M'Kenzie browbeat and

threatened them with an assize of error, if they dared to return any other verdict than that of *guilty*!

The first trial, which took place this year before this disgraceful court, was that of two young women, Isabel Alison and Marion Harvey, whose condemnation can be justified by no historian. The first of these females was a native of Perth, of sober and religious habits, but who had occasionally heard Mr. Cargill and several other ministers preach in the fields. For this grievous offence, and for uttering some expressions against the severity used on a few Covenanters in the neighbourhood, she was seized and carried before a magistrate. There, in her simplicity, she confessed that she had conversed with several persons who had been declared rebels, in consequence of which she was sent under a guard to Edinburgh. When brought before the council, the most captious and ensnaring questions were put to her, and by means partly of promises, and partly of threats, she was brought to acknowledge acquaintance with Rathillet, Balfour, and others concerned in the archbishop's death. She was accordingly, along with her companion, sisted before the justi-

ciary court. The following is part of her examination, written with artless simplicity by her own hand :—“The bishop said, wherein is our doctrine erroneous? I said, that was better debated already than a poor lass could debate it. They said, your ministers do not approve of these things; and ye have said more than your ministers; for your ministers have brought you on to these opinions, and left you there. I said, they had cast in baits among the ministers, and harled them aside; and although ministers say one thing to-day, and another to-morrow, we are not obliged to follow them in that. Then they said they pitied me; for (said they) we find reason and a quick wit in you; and they desired me to take it to advisement. I told them, I had been advising on it these seven years, and I hoped not to change now. They inquired, mockingly, if I lectured any. I answered, Quakers used to do so. They asked, if I did not own Presbyterian principles. I answered that I did. They asked if I was distempered. I told them I was always solid in the wit that God had given me. Lastly, they asked my name. I told them, if they had staged me, they might remember my name. Then they caused bring the Sanquhar Declara-

tion, and the paper found on Mr. Richard Cameron, and the papers taken at the Queensferry, and asked if I would adhere to them. I said, I would, as they were according to the Scriptures, and I saw not wherein they did contradict them. They asked if ever Mr. Welsh or Mr. Riddel taught me these principles. I answered, I would be far wrong to speak any thing that might wrong them. Then they bade me take heed what I was saying, for it was upon life and death that I was questioned. I asked them if they would have me to lie. I would not quit one truth, though it would purchase my life a thousand years, which ye cannot purchase, nor promise me an hour. They said, when saw ye the two Hendersons and John Balfour? Seeing ye love ingenuity, will ye be ingenuous, and tell us if ye saw them since the death of the bishop? I said, they appeared publicly within the land since. They asked if I conversed with them withir these twelve months: at which I kept silence. They urged me to say yes or nay. I answered, Yes. Then they said, your blood be on your own head; we shall be free of it. I answered, so said Pilate; but it was a question if it was so; but ye have nothing to say against me

but for owning of Christ's truths and his persecuted members: to which they answered nothing." (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 116.)

The other prisoner, Marion Harvey, was only about twenty years of age, and was a servant in Borrowstouness. She was seized upon the highway, as she was walking quietly along to attend upon a sermon, and dragged before the council. Ensnaring questions, similar to those put to Isabel Alison, were asked her, and her answers were produced as evidence before the court, in presence of which, as already noticed, she was empanelled along with her companion in suffering. With great difficulty the court procured a jury; and even those who were compelled to act in that capacity were exceedingly unwilling to return a verdict against the prisoners. Several of the jury urged that "there was no fact proven against them." But M'Kenzie replied that the prisoners' words were treason; and ordered them to act according to law, otherwise he knew what to do. Being thus threatened, the jury at length found them both guilty of treason; and they were condemned to be executed in the Grass-market on the 26th of January. (*Scots Worthies*, p. 309.)

When about to be led out to execution, Paterson, bishop of Edinburgh, with wanton cruelty, said to Marion Harvey, “ Marion, you would never hear a curate, but now you shall be forced to hear one pray before you die !” and immediately ordered one of his suffragans, who was present, to pray. The poor woman could not retire ; but addressing her fellow-prisoner, she said, “ Come Isabel, let us sing the twenty-third psalm ;” in doing which they completely drowned the voice of the servile curate, and disappointed the unfeeling and impious prelate.\* Their dying speeches on the scaffold do no dishonour to the age in which they lived, more especially when it is recollected that they were the production of unlettered females. “ They that would follow Christ,” cried Isabel Alison, “ need not scarce at the cross, for I can set my

\* This was not the only outrage which was committed on these humble but godly sufferers. “ I am informed,” says Wodrow, “ they were executed with some three or four wicked women, guilty of murdering their own children, and other villanies ; which was very grievous to them. One of the Episcopal ministers of the town, who waited upon the others to the scaffold, railed bitterly upon the sufferers, and assured them they were on the road to damnation, while without any evidence of penitence, he was sending the other wicked wretches straight to heaven. However, they were not even moved, but sang some suitable psalms on the scaffold and prayed.” Hist., vol. iii. p. 277.

seal to it, ‘his yoke is easy, and his burden is light.’ He is the only desirable master, but he must be followed fully. Rejoice in him, all ye that love him—let not your hearts faint nor your hands be feeble. Go on in the strength of the Lord, for I hope he will yet have a remnant both of sons and daughters that will cleave to him, though they will be very few, ‘even as berries on the top of the outmost branches.’” “I am not come here for murder,” said Marion Harvey, “for they have no matter of fact to charge me with, but only my judgment. I am about twenty years of age; at fourteen or fifteen I was a hearer of the curates and indulged; and while I was a hearer of these, I was a blasphemer and sabbath-breaker, and a chapter of the Bible was a burden to me; but since I heard this persecuted gospel, I durst not blaspheme nor break the Sabbath, and the Bible became my delight.” These two virgin martyrs were then thrown over, and died in the full confidence of a blessed immortality. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 132.)

Still thirsting for the blood of the Covenanters, the council, on the 2d of March, indicted John Murray and Christopher Miller, and on the 8th, William Gougar and Robert

Sangster before the justiciary court. Their confessions at their examinations before the council, which were pretty similar to those of the two preceding martyrs, were the only evidence produced against them; yet they were found guilty, and condemned to be executed on the 11th. John Murray received a respite previous to the day appointed, but the other three were executed according to their sentence, leaving behind them a joint testimony to the cause for which they suffered. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 133. *Scots Worthies*, p. 317.)

The activity of the council in indicting and putting to death so many of the Covenanters, did not in the least prevent them from harassing and oppressing all genuine Presbyterians in every part of the country. The Laird of Meldrum, to whom ample powers had been already given to search for and punish those who favoured the rising at Bothwell, was enjoined to prosecute, with the utmost rigour, all whom he suspected to be inimical to Prelacy. Informers were encouraged and rewarded; the military were authorized to search every house for “rebels;” and the magistrates of Edinburgh were ordered to summon all tavern-keepers before them, and lay

them under a bond of 5000 merks, to allow no newspaper to be read in their houses, “but such as were approved of by the officers of state.”

Among the numerous informers who were hired by the council to betray the Covenanters into their hands, we shall instance only one, namely, Thomas Kennoway, of the king’s guards. This petty tyrant, having repaired to the parish of Livingstone on the 19th of March, with a party of soldiers, issued orders for the apprehension of all who had been at Bothwell. Parties were immediately dispatched in quest of offenders ; and having received information of one young man who was suspected to have joined with the *rebels*, Kennoway himself headed the company who proceeded to the house where he lodged, in order to apprehend him. What followed is thus related by Wodrow : “The house was beset, and being near a moss, Kennoway himself rode betwixt the house and the moss, that none might escape ; his men went in, and searched the house for the man and his arms ; the man who lived there was very aged, and had two sons, the one was not in Kennoway’s list ; and after the party had searched all the house for arms, and broke

open all chests and presses, and found none, they brought the old man to Kennoway, who raged, and called him old devil, and swore he would hang him upon one end of a tow and his son upon the other, and ordered his men to bring out all the men in the house and carry them to the next house they were to attack. When they had carried them a good way, Kennoway suffered the old man and one of his sons to go home, and kept the other prisoner. Providence ordered it so, that the young man informed against was the person they let go, not having exact knowledge of him, it being dark. With their prisoner they came to another country town a good distance from the first house, where Kennoway alighted, and made the prisoner cast off his coat in a cold stormy night, and cover his horse with it, till the poor man was scarcely able to stand for cold. In that place the man they were searching for escaped—but Kennoway carried away his father prisoner in his room. After they had thus spent the night, early in the Sabbath morning they came to the Swine-abby, a public house, put their prisoners in a room, and when they had lights, and saw the young man, Kennoway swore bloodily he feared he had brought

the wrong man.” Efforts were accordingly made to secure the old man and his son whom they had dismissed; but the former was lying dangerously ill, in consequence of the cruel treatment which he had received, and the latter had made his escape. But though Kennoway was obliged to dismiss the prisoners he had already secured, the young man died in a few days from the effects of the brutal treatment which he had received. (Wodrow, vol. iii. pp. 243, 244.) Ruining fines followed this military crusade, and oaths were imposed on all the inhabitants in that and the adjoining parishes, that “no converse had been held with rebels.”

Similar outrages were committed in the south, where military courts were held in almost every parish, and fines and imprisonment inflicted on all whom the prelates accused of adhering to Presbyterian principles. Cornet Graham, in particular, compelled every individual in Galloway, above sixteen years of age, to depone upon oath, accompanied by the most profane imprecations, not only that he “had never been at any field meetings, or countenanced such as haunted them, or was married or had children baptized by such as preached at them.”

but “that he did not know of any of his neighbours, or any in the parish,” who had been guilty of these *fearful crimes!* Grier-son of Lagg, a most bloody persecutor of the Covenanters, acted a part still more arbitrary and cruel, completely ruining multitudes who had no concern whatever in the late fruitless attempt to throw off the iron yoke of civil and religious despotism. (Crook-shank, vol. ii. p. 77.)

While the military and their assistants were thus employed, the council continued to fine and imprison the obnoxious Presbyterians with the most relentless severity. Multitudes were forfeited for no crime but that of refusing to abjure their religion ; their estates were conferred on their persecutors, and themselves declared outlaws, and doomed to destruction whenever apprehended. Although few conventicles were held in any part of the kingdom, renewed and still more severe proclamations were published against such as should dare to countenance, in any form, what the council had thought proper to designate “rendezvous of rebellion!” And to extinguish the very embers of Presbyterianism, additional garrisons were appointed in various parts of the country, to

overawe and punish all who presumed to murmur a complaint against the tyranny of their oppressors. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 244.)

Many of the Presbyterian ministers having taken refuge in Edinburgh, a new search was ordered to be made throughout that city, for all who were disaffected to the government either in church or state. Among others who were apprehended at that time was Mr. Blackader, who, on the 5th of April, was seized by Major Johnston, and carried before the council. Having there confessed that he was a Presbyterian minister, who was ordained at Troqueer in 1653, his examination proceeded as follows :—“ *Q.* Did you excommunicate the king ; or was you at Torwood at that time ? *A.* I have not been at Torwood these four years.\* *Q.* But what do you think of it ? do you approve of it ? *A.* Though I be as free to answer to that as well as to all the former, yet I must tell you, I came here to give account of my judgment to no man ; therefore, seeing this is an interrogating of me about my thoughts, I humbly beg to be excused. Produce a libel, and I’ll endea-

\* Mr. Blackader was not connected with the party who adhered to Cargill, and in some minor points differed from them in sentiment.

vour to answer it as I can. *Q.* But do you approve of taking the king's life, and condemning him in soul and body? *A.* No, I do not, and no good man will. *Q.* Sir, you have done yourself a favour in saying so. But we hear you keep conventicles since the last indemnity? *A.* I have the honour to be lawfully and duly called to the sacred function, and am bound to exercise that office as I shall be answerable at the great day. *Q.* But you have preached in the fields, that is, on moors and hill sides. I shall not ask you if you have preached in houses or not, though there is not liberty even for that. *A.* I place no case of conscience, nor make any difference betwixt preaching in the houses or in the fields, but as may best serve the convenience of the hearers; nor know I of any restriction lying on me from the word of God, where I have my commission, which reaches to houses and fields, within and without doors. *Q.* You know, and no doubt have seen the laws discharging such preaching? *A.* My lord, no doubt I have, and I am sorry that there ever should have been laws and acts made against the preaching of the gospel. *Q.* Not against the gospel, but against sedition and rebellion. *A.* I preach

no sedition or rebellion." (Blackader's Mem. pp. 274—276.) After this examination Mr. Blackader was sentenced to be banished to the Bass, whither he was conveyed shortly afterwards.

Another eminent sufferer for Presbytery at that period was Mr. John Spreul, apothecary in Glasgow, who, as already noticed, had been apprehended and imprisoned at the close of the preceding year. When examined at that time before the council, his answers were considered to be unsatisfactory, and he was ordered to be put to the torture, in presence of the Duke of York,\* and a committee specially selected for that purpose. While the executioner was performing his horrid work, Mr. Spreul was interrogated as to his knowledge concerning the pretended plot against the Duke's life, his acquaintance with Mr. Cargill's place of concealment, &c.

\* "When any are to be struck in the boots," says Burnet, "it is done in the presence of the council, and upon that occasion almost all offer to run away. The sight is so dreadful, that without an order restraining such a number to stay, the board would be forsaken. But the Duke of York, while he had been in Scotland, was so far from withdrawing, that he looked on, all the while, with an unmoved indifference, and with an attention as if he had been to look upon some curious experiment! This gave a terrible idea of him to all that observed it, as of a man that had no bowels nor humanity in him." Hist., vol. ii. p. 1004.

of which he still declared his utter ignorance. Finding that nothing further could be elicited from him, he was, with the greatest inhumanity, ordered to be tortured a second time, when he endured without departing in any point from his former declaration, and with a fortitude that astonished his tormentors.\* He was then remanded to prison to await his trial before the judiciary court. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 254.)

After lying in prison till the month of March, an incident occurred which determined his persecutors to accomplish his ruin. The Duke of York, who harassed and brow-beat the prisoners on every opportunity, having abruptly said to Mr. Spreul, "Sir, would you kill the king?" the prisoner addressing himself to the chancellor, replied, "My lord, I bless God I am no papist: I loath and abhor all those jesuitical and murdering principles; neither my parents nor the ministers I heard, ever taught me such principles." This was enough. Mr. Spreul immediately received his indictment, but from some cause

\* Dalyell having complained, during this second outrage on humanity, that the executioner did not strike with sufficient force upon the wedges, the latter replied that he struck with all his strength, and offered the bloody monster the hammer to perform the work himself!!

not accounted for, his trial did not take place till June. On the 10th of that month, he was brought before the court. In vain did his counsel contend, that having been twice tortured, and still continuing to deny the crimes laid to his charge, "by the law of this and of all other nations he ought to be acquitted." The court repelled the objection, and the trial proceeded. The jury, however, though threatened by M'Kenzie with an assize of error if they should acquit him, unanimously found him to be innocent of the charges which were laid against him in the indictment. But instead of being liberated, Mr. Spreul was most unjustly recommitted to prison, fined in £500 sterling, and banished to the Bass. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 262.)

Still proceeding in their work of cruelty, the council, on the 11th of July, indicted before the justiciary court Adam Philip, Lawrence Hay, and Andrew Pittuloch, three poor but pious Presbyterians. No act of rebellion was so much as alleged against them, but they were charged with being guilty of joining in a society in Fife for prayer and conference, of refusing to hear the curates, and of having signed a paper entitled, "A testimony against the evils of

the times.” For these unpardonable crimes, of which they candidly acknowledged themselves to be guilty, they were condemned by the court, and executed on the 13th of that month. They all died expressing their firm attachment to those principles which it was the unwearied aim of the government to destroy. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 144, et seq. *Scots Worthies*, p. 326.)

At a period so destructive to every thing which had the smallest appearance of genuine religion, it can excite no surprise that some individuals should have imbibed tenets at once unscriptural and extravagant; more especially as the greater part of the nation had complied, in one form or other, with the mandates of government, while a few only adhered to the original principles of the Covenanters. About this time, accordingly, a set of enthusiasts sprung up, whose number never exceeded thirty persons, chiefly women, who assumed the title of the “Sweet Singers.” Their leader, John Gib, from whom they received the name of Gibbites, was a sailor in Borrowstouness. Among other absurd principles which these deluded people maintained, were, their rejection of the psalms in metre, the “impression and translation of

the Old and New Testaments," on account of the preface to King James, and the dividing of them into chapters and verses; the confession of faith, covenants, Presbyterian worship, and form of church government; the naming of months and days, &c., all of which being enumerated in a large paper, they committed to the flames, "as seemed good to them and to the Holy Ghost" to do. "We also renounce," say they, "all authority throughout the world, and all that are in authority, and all their acts and edicts, from the tyrant Charles Stuart to the lowest tyrant."\* In vain did Mr. Cargill and other Presbyterians endeavour to reclaim them; they spurned at either admonition or reproof, and were consequently disowned by all Presbyterians in the kingdom. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 41.)

At length the whole party were seized by a troop of dragoons and carried to Edinburgh, where the men were imprisoned in the Canongate tolbooth, and the women confined

\* *Gib's Blasphemous Paper.* Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 350. *Informatory Vindication*, p. 9. Burnet seems to class the Gibbites with the Covenanters, (vol. ii. p. 187;) but this is what might have been expected from this writer, whom we will not accuse of having been actuated by malice, though certainly, in many points, he displays considerable ignorance with regard to the Covenanters.

in the house of correction. Here they committed new extravagancies, and were faithfully admonished in a letter written to them by Mr. Cargill. They were not the individuals, however, on whom the council wished to wreak their fury; and accordingly, having abjured their “disloyal principles,” they were liberated about the beginning of August.

But though the council manifested a degree of clemency towards those poor deluded creatures, which we have looked for in vain for many years past, their rage against the Presbyterians continued without the smallest abatement. One minister alone, namely, Mr. Donald Cargill, as we have already seen, had the courage to preach in the fields; but now that minister also fell into the hands of the persecutors. His last sermon was preached upon Dunsyre common, between Clydesdale and Lothian, on the 10th of July, from Isa. xxvi. 20, 21. Through the persuasion of Mr. Smith and Mr. Boig, two of his hearers, he went that evening with the lady of St. John’s Kirk, after it was dark, to Covington Mill, and lodged in the house of one Andrew Fisher. James Irving of Boushaw, however, having received some intimation of his place

of retreat, marched to the house with a party of the military, and early next morning apprehended the minister together with Boig and Smith. Five thousand merks having been offered for Mr. Cargill's apprehension, Bonshaw could not conceal his joy at the expected reward for the martyr's blood. "O blessed Bonshaw," he exclaimed, "and blessed day that ever I was born, that has found such a prize this morning!" (Life of Cargill, p. 37.

Without loss of time, Bonshaw marched his prisoners to Lanark, where the soldiers, having taken some refreshment, mounted their prisoners on the bare backs of horses, with their faces to the tails, and their feet tied below the bellies, of the animals. The binding of Mr. Cargill was performed by Bonshaw himself, who drew the cords so tight, that the good man, looking down upon him, said, "Why do you tie me so hard? your wickedness is great; you will not long escape the just judgment of God, and, if I be not mistaken, it will seize you in this place."\* In this position they were carried

\* Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 85. "And this was verified," adds that author; "for soon after he got the price of his blood, he was killed in a duel near Lanark. His last

to Glasgow, where Mr. Cargill had been formerly a minister, and led in triumph to the jail, amidst a crowd of people, who could express their sympathy only by their tears. One individual alone dared to mock the venerable martyr. John Nisbet, the archbishop's factor, a most notorious profligate, alluding to an expression very often used by Mr. Cargill when preaching, exclaimed, "Mr. Donald, will you give us one word more?" Fixing on him a look of sorrow mingled with regret, Mr. Cargill replied, "Mock not, lest your bands be made strong; the day is coming when you shall not have one word to say though you would."\*

The prisoners were conveyed to Edinburgh the next day; and on the 15th, Messrs. Cargill, Boig, and Smith were examined before the council. The usual ensnaring questions being tendered to them, several of which they answered whilst they declined words were 'God damn my soul eternally, for I am gone!'"

\* "This came very shortly to pass," says Wodrow; "not many days after the Lord was pleased to lay his hand upon that ill man: at Glasgow, where he lived, he fell suddenly ill, and for three days his tongue swelled; and though he seemed very earnest to speak, yet he could not command one word, and died in great torment and seeming terror." Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 279.—Life of Cargill, p. 38.

others, these three prisoners, together with William Thomson and William Cuthil, were arraigned at the bar of the justiciary court on the 26th, with the previous determination to put them all to death. A short process was sufficient, their confessions before the council being all the evidence adduced against hem. Upon this evidence, however, the jury returned a verdict, finding “Mr. Cargill guilty of treasonably declining the king’s authority, and being at Bothwell; and the other four as guilty of owning the Sanquhar Declaration, and disowning the king’s authority.” The court then sentenced the prisoners to be executed on the day following, namely, the 27th, and the heads of Messrs. Cargill, Boig, and Smith, to be fixed on the Netherbow port, and those of the other two on the West Port of Edinburgh. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 282.)

Though Mr. Cargill was denied pen and ink during the few hours allotted to him before his execution, he procured means to write and subscribe a testimony to the cause for which he was so soon to suffer death. “This is the most joyful day that ever I saw in my pilgrimage on earth,” says he in that paper; “my joy is now begun, which I see shall

never be interrupted. I see both *my* interest and *His* truth, and the sureness of the one, and the preciousness of the other. My preaching has occasioned persecution, but the want of it will, I fear, occasion worse. However, I have preached the truths of God to others, as it is written, ‘I believed, and so I preached;’ and I have not an ill conscience in preaching truth, whatever has followed; and this day I am to seal with my blood all the truths that I ever preached: and what is controverted of that which I have been professing shall, ere long, be manifested by God’s judgments in the consciences of men.—As to the causes of my suffering: the main is, ‘Not acknowledging the present authority, as it is established in the supremacy and explanatory act.’ This is the magistracy that I have rejected, that was invested with Christ’s power. And seeing *that* power, taken from Christ which is his glory, and made the essential of the crown, I thought this was, as if I had seen one wearing my husband’s garments after he had killed him.” When on the scaffold, though annoyed by the beating of drums, he declared, when going up the ladder, that he did so with less fear and perturbation of

mind than ever he entered the pulpit to preach. "And now," he added, "I am near to the getting of my crown, which shall be sure; for I bless the Lord, and desire all of you to bless him, that he hath brought me here, and makes me triumph over devils, and men, and sin; they shall wound me no more.—I pray that sufferers may be kept from sin, and helped to know their duty." (Life of Cargill, p. 40. Cloud of Witnesses, pp. 30, 32.)

Walter Smith, one of his companions in suffering, was the second who ascended the ladder. "This is the main point, this day, in controversy," said that martyr, "upon which I was peremptorily questioned, and was desired positively to answer, yea or nay, under the threatening of the boots, viz. Whether I owned the king's authority as presently established and exercised? which I did positively disown, and denied allegiance to him, as he is invested with the supremacy proper to Jesus Christ only. And who knoweth not, that at first he was constituted and crowned a covenanted king, and the subjects sworn in allegiance to him, as such, by the solemn league and covenant? This was the authority wherewith he was

clothed, and the exercise of it was to be for God, religion, and the good of the subjects ; and is not all this, as to God and his people, overturned and perverted ? ” (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 48.) Then addressing the spectators, “ I exhort all of you that are the poor remnant,” said he, “ to be serious in getting your interest cleared ; you that are in the dark with your case, take not flashes for conversion ; study a holy conversation ; be at more pains to know the Scriptures and believe them ; be serious in prayer ; slight not time ; take Christ on his own terms, and resolve to meet with trials, and that shortly ; slight not known duties ; commit not known sins, whatever suffering ye may meet with for cleaving to duty.”

The other intimate friend and follower of Mr. Cargill, who suffered death that day along with himself, was James Boig, a student of divinity, and a young man of piety and talent. He left no particular testimony further than what is contained in a letter written to his brother from the jail, in which sentiments are expressed similar to those which were uttered by the two martyrs already noticed. (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 52.)

William Thomson and William Cuthil, the

two remaining sufferers, left behind them large testimonies against all the evils and defections of the times, condemning not only the council and the prelates, upon whom they laid the guilt of their blood, but the indulged ministers, and their adherents, as having sinfully joined with the persecutors, and given a tacit consent to the overthrow of the church of Christ in Scotland. All these martyrs died “under much comfort, joy, and full assurance.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 284. Scots Worthies, p. 357, et seq.)

The day following these executions, the parliament, after a lapse of nine years, assembled in Edinburgh. After reading the king’s letter, the Duke of York, who had been appointed commissioner, addressed them in a formal speech, reiterating what had been stated by his majesty concerning his determination inviolably to maintain and protect the Protestant Episcopalian religion, and expressing his firm belief that they would “vigorously assert and clear his majesty’s royal prerogative, and declare the rights of the crown in its natural and legal course of descent.” By this speech it was evident to all, that the meeting of the legislature at that time was chiefly for the purpose of securing the duke’s

succession, and, of course, the triumph of popery in Britain.

As a matter of course, the first act passed by this parliament, which was embodied in as few words as possible, ratified all the acts formerly made in favour of the Protestant religion, but in compliment to the commissioner, omitting the words, “and all acts against popery.” Their second act, however, which secured the succession in favour of the duke, was not only servile and base, but unhinged the whole frame of a Protestant and free constitution. “The estates of parliament,” says this statute, “considering that the kings of this realm, deriving their royal power from the Almighty God alone, do succeed lineally thereto, according to the known degrees of proximity in blood, which cannot be interrupted, suspended, or diverted by any act or statute whatsoever, and that none can attempt to alter or divert the said succession, without involving the subjects of this kingdom in perjury and rebellion—do therefore recognise, acknowledge, and declare, that the right to the imperial crown of this realm, is, by the inherent right, and the nature of the monarch, as well as by the fundamental and unalterable laws of this

realm, transmitted and devolved by a lineal succession, according to the proximity of blood;—and that no difference in religion, nor no law nor act of parliament made, or *to be made*, can alter or divert the right of succession and lineal descent of the crown to the nearest and lawful heirs.” (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 889. Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 291.) This “everlasting act,” confirming as it did the succession of the lineal descendants of the house of Stuart, is truly ridiculous, more especially when we reflect that in seven years afterwards these very lineal descendants were by another act of parliament rendered fugitives and vagabonds on the face of the earth.

Having given a new supply to government for the purpose of suppressing “seditious and rebellious field conventicles, and supporting the army in bearing them down,” the parliament next proceeded to pass an act for securing the peace of the country. Instead of viewing the prelates and their supporters as the disturbers of the public peace, all the evils under which the nation groaned were, as usual, charged upon the Covenanters—those noble patriots who dared to plant the standard of freedom amidst the solitudes of a country sunk into a state of the most abject

servility. Against such men, and against all who were suspected of favouring their cause, the act declares, “that all tenants and servants, delated upon the informer’s oath of calumny, within three months shall be held as confessed, and guilty of being at field conventicles, or of reset and converse; that the landlord or master must pay the fine, providing the person found guilty have goods which will pay his rent, and if not, he is to dismiss him presently out of his land and service with his family, or present him to justice; and that those who shall afterwards receive such servants as are thus dismissed, shall be liable to pay three years’ rent or fee to their master or landlord who dismissed them, and a hundred pounds to the king.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 293.)

But the most disgraceful and impious act which was passed by this parliament was that entitled, “An act anent religion and the test.” The feeble security which had been given concerning the maintenance of the Protestant religion having alarmed several of the members, it was proposed to impose a test on all who held any public office either civil or ecclesiastical, excepting the members of the royal family. But while this test re-

cognised the security of Protestantism according to the confession of faith drawn up by John Knox, and ratified by parliament in 1567, it bound the subscribers to a renunciation of all the principles which were maintained and sworn to at the Reformation in that very confession. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 893.) In order to show the absurdity, impiety, and self-contradiction of this abominable oath, which entailed ruin on thousands throughout the country, we shall give it here. "I ————— solemnly swear, in presence of the eternal God, whom I invoke as judge and witness of my sincere intention in this my oath, that I own and sincerely profess the true Protestant religion, contained in the first parliament of King James VI., and that I believe the same to be founded on and agreeable to the word of God; and I promise and swear, that I shall adhere thereunto during all the days of my life-time, and shall endeavour to educate my children therein, and I shall never consent to any change or alteration contrary thereunto; and that I disown and renounce all such principles, doctrines, or practices, whether popish or fanatical, which are contrary unto, and inconsistent with the said Protestant religion

and confession of faith: And, for testification of my obedience to my most gracious sovereign Charles II., I do affirm and swear by this my solemn oath, that the king's majesty is the only supreme governor of this realm, over all persons, and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as civil; and that no foreign prince, person, &c., hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, or authority, ecclesiastical or civil, within this realm: and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions—and do promise, that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the king's majesty, his heirs and lawful successors; and, to my power, shall assist and defend all rights, jurisdictions, prerogatives, &c., belonging to the king's majesty, his heirs and lawful successors: And I further affirm and swear by this my solemn oath, that I judge it unlawful for subjects, upon pretence of reformation, or any pretence whatsoever, to enter into covenants or leagues, or to convocate, convene, or assemble in any councils, conventions, or assemblies, to treat, consult, or determine in any matter of state, civil or ecclesiastical, without his majesty's special command, or express license had

thereunto ; or to take up arms against the king, or those commissionate by him ; and that I shall never so rise in arms, or enter into such covenants or assemblies, and that there lies no obligation upon me from the national covenant, or the solemn league and covenant, or any other manner or way whatsoever, to endeavour any change or alteration in the government, either in church or state, as it is now established by the laws of this kingdom : and I promise and swear that I shall, with my utmost power, defend, assist, and maintain his majesty's jurisdiction fore-said, against all deadly ; and I shall never decline his majesty's power and jurisdiction, as I shall answer to God. And finally, I affirm and swear, that this my solemn oath is given in the plain genuine sense and meaning of the words, without any equivocation, mental reservation, or any manner of evasion whatsoever ; and that I shall not accept or use any dispensation from any creature whatsoever. So help me God." (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 296. Burnet, vol. ii. p. 894.)

This medley of Popery, Prelacy, and absurdity, alarmed several of the members of parliament. The draft of the bill was brought

in at first without any reference to the confession of faith ; but even when that clause was added, its complex and self-contradictory nature occasioned a long and warm debate. The Earl of Argyle, in particular, requested that as few public oaths as possible should be framed ; that such as were requisite should be short and clear ; and that, instead of the proposed test, a simple clause should be added to the oath of allegiance, which in itself was a sufficient remedy against fanatics. He also opposed the clause exempting the royal family from taking the oath, and proposed that the Duke of York alone should be excepted. It was, he said, the happiness of the country that the king and people were of one religion by law, and he hoped the parliament would do nothing to loose what was fast, nor open a gap for the royal family to differ in religion. The duke immediately rose and expressed his high displeasure at these remarks ; upon which Argyle added, that if this exception passed, it would do more prejudice to the Protestant religion than all the rest of the act would do good. The bill was, however, passed that very day, and all in public trust, except the royal family were ordered to take

it under the severest penalty. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 94.)

Shortly after the rising of parliament, the Duke of York made a tour to the west. He was received in every place with the greatest enthusiasm, and was splendidly entertained by the public authorities. None expressed any disapprobation of his conduct but the small, yet determined band who were hunted like partridges on the mountains. They alone dared to protest against the advancement of a papist and a tyrant to the throne. While walking through the streets of Glasgow, receiving the acclamations of a deluded populace, one of these persecuted Covenanters boldly presented to him a paper, which, imagining to be a petition, he very graciously received. To his utter astonishment, however, he found it to contain a protest against the king for his tyranny in “heading, hanging, quartering quick, stigmatizing, scourging, drowning in seas, and oppressing the people of God;” and his bestowing the government of Scotland on a professed papist—after he had sinned away his own understanding with harlots—to cheat the people out of their souls as well as their property. No sooner had the duke read this paper than

he hastily left Glasgow, and returned to the capital, with the firm resolution of wreaking his vengeance on all who scrupled to take the abominable test. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 348 )

Before proceeding however, to give an account of the illegal manner in which that bond was enforced, and the dreadful effects which followed, we shall close the present chapter with another specimen of the cruelty exercised by the council upon the adherents to the principles of Cameron and Cargill. On the 17th of October, Robert Garnock, Patrick Forman, David Fairie, James Stewart, George Lapsley, and Alexander Russell, having been examined before the council, were indicted to stand trial before the justiciary court for non-conformity. Robert Garnock had lain in prison since 1679 for refusing to take the bond, and nothing of a criminal nature could be charged against him, except his confession, in which he disowned the authority of the persecutors. Patrick Forman had been apprehended with a knife in his possession with this inscription, “for cutting tyrants’ throats;” and being asked if it was to kill the king, he replied, “if the

king be a tyrant, why not cut his throat?"\* David Fairie, Alexander Russell, and George Lapsley were ensnared into a confession of their renunciation of the king's authority, and were consequently indicted, according to the illegal manner of the government, for no other crime than what had been extorted from them concerning their private opinions. But the case of James Stewart was the most barbarous and unjust. He was a young man—or rather a boy—of singular piety, and had never been accused of transgressing any one of the numerous laws then in force. Having come from the west country to visit a relative in prison, who effected his escape by some means or other while Stewart was in the cell, he was seized and carried before the council. On refusing to answer several of their inquisitorial questions, Sir George M'Kenzie threatened to pull out his tongue with a pair of pincers!

\* That *individuals*, among whom this was one, were driven to act a part and to use language so unbecoming, can excite no surprise, considering the severity with which they were used. They were, however, few in number; and while we condemn *their* departures from right principles, what condemnation is due to those by whom they were driven to such desperation? Neither are the rash and unwarrantable expressions of one or two to be laid to the charge of the Covenanters in general.

The answers which were wrung from him concerning his adherence to Presbyterian principles were, however, deemed sufficient to effect his condemnation ; and he was placed along with his companions at the bar of the justiciary court. (*Cloud of Witnesses. Scots Worthies.*)

The trial of these six non-conformists was short ; but before the jury retired to make up their verdict, the prisoners presented to them a paper, in which they advised them to reflect on what they were doing, and upon what grounds they could return a verdict of guilty. In this paper they denied that they were rebels, or disowned any authority which was agreeable to the word of God or the covenants, to which the nation was bound by solemn oath. After warning them of the guilt of covenant-breaking—of the account which they would one day have to make to the Judge of all—and against imitating the example of former juries who had committed so many acts of injustice and cruelty ; they concluded by charging them to beware of bringing on themselves the guilt of innocent blood. Notwithstanding this solemn appeal, the jury returned a verdict against all the prisoners, finding them guilty on their

own confessions. They were then condemned to be executed at the Gallow-lee, between Edinburgh and Leith, on the 10th of the month, and their heads and hands to be fixed on the Pleasance port. The reason for this change in the place of execution appears to have been on account of the multitude of spectators, on whom the dying speeches of the martyrs made such an impression that it was thought proper to discontinue their execution in the city. Nay, so afraid were the council of the spectators imbibing the sentiments of the sufferers, that they not unfrequently ordered them to be put to death at a very early hour in the morning. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 101.)

The execution of five of these prisoners—George Lapsley having previously effected his escape—was, however, attended by an immense crowd. Their dying testimonies were similar to those left by former sufferers. After successively addressing the people, they were executed according to their sentence, and their bodies were interred at the foot of the gibbet. Among the spectators was James Renwick, who had attached himself to the cause of the persecuted Covenanters. With the assistance of a few others, this eminently

pious youth removed the bodies of these martyrs by night, and buried them in the West Church cemetery. (Renwick's Life, p. 46.) He had also the courage to take down their heads and hands from the Pleasance port, but being prevented at that time from depositing them beside their bodies, he interred these fragments of the sufferers in a garden lying between the castle foot and the West Port.



## CHAPTER IV.

The Duke of York enforces the test—reasons by the ministers of Aberdeen for its rejection—Bishop Paterson's explanation—its futility—Argyle takes the test with an explanation—refuses to swear it as a commissioner of the treasury—he is removed from all offices of trust—his imprisonment—his indictment—he is found guilty of treason—escapes from prison—his sentence—consternation of the Protestants in both kingdoms—severe satire on these proceedings by the boys of George Heriot's hospital—state of the Covenanters—the followers of Cargill form themselves into societies—Lanark Declaration—violence of the council—case of Mr. Frazer of Brae.

No sooner did the Duke of York return to Edinburgh than he proceeded to enforce the test. Few, comparatively, in any public situation, scrupled to swear that oath ; yet among these few, were several of the Episcopalian

clergy,\* who published their reasons why it could not conscientiously be taken. The ministers of Aberdeen, in particular, drew up a number of queries, in which—whatever their own views of the confession of Faith might be—the absurdity and inconsistency of the test was completely exposed, and satisfactory evidence adduced that no man could swear it without being guilty of perjury. How can any person swear, it is asked, to take that confession as the rule of faith, which, contrary to the other clauses in the test, forbids the resisting of the magistrate only conditionally, while they do not pass over the bounds of their office ; and says, that it is a good work to bear down tyranny ? How can he swear that he believes the king is the only supreme governor over all persons and in all causes, when that confession obliges him to believe that Jesus Christ is the only head of the church ? If he believes the present church to be of divine and apostolic authority, how can he swear that it is in the king's power to alter it at his pleasure ? How can he swear never to enter into any bonds or covenants,

\* Burnet says, "the *bishops* went all into it," vol. ii. p. 895.

on any pretence whatever, when it was lawful in the first ages of Christianity to enter into a Covenant with Christ, and a league with one another, to cast off the yoke of Judaism and idolatry, though contrary to the command of princes? And should Popery prevail, would it be unlawful to enter into a covenant for shaking off the Romish yoke? Can any individual swear that he judges it to be unlawful for subjects to convene in any assemblies to consult or determine in any matter of state, civil or ecclesiastical, seeing he has no security from the test, or the laws of the land, but that clause may comprehend the assembling for the worship of God, or the exercise of discipline, more especially as all ecclesiastical meetings are put into the king's hand? Can he swear that he is under no obligation to endeavour to effect any change or alteration in the government of the church or state, as it is now established by law, when that confession teaches that no policy or order of ceremonies in the church can be appointed for all ages, places, and times, because what is now convenient may prove burdensome at another time, or in other circumstances? It must be a perfect constitution that requires no change in any

circumstances, and yet an alteration in circumstances is a change. If there be no more in this test than in former oaths, why is it imposed on those who took the declaration? (Wodrow, vol. iii. pp. 304, 305.)

This opposition of the clergy in Aberdeen was followed by that of the diocesan synod of Perth, and the greater part of the indulged Presbyterian ministers. To remove their scruples, Paterson, bishop of Edinburgh, drew up an explanation of the test, which being laid before the council, was considered too long;\* but the following abridgment of it was approved of, and even received the sanction of his majesty. "That the confession of faith ratified in the parliament 1567, was formed in the infancy of our reformation, and deserves its own praise; yet, by the test, we do not swear to every proposition, or clause therein contained, but only the true

\* While Paterson was reading this paper, the Duke of York, tired at its tedious length, interrupted the right reverend prelate with the coarse proverbial saying, "the first chapter of John with a stone, will chase away a dog." Paterson of course desisted reading, and the above abridgment was substituted. Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 303. Paterson was a man of any, or rather of no religion: nay, so indifferent was he about either Protestantism or Popery, that he told the duke that a few grains of loyalty, in which the former had the better of the latter, alone turned the scale with him. Burnet, vol. ii. p. 894.

protestant religion, founded upon the word of God, contained in that confession, as it is opposed to popery and fanaticism: That by this test, or any clause therein contained, no invasion or encroachment is intended or made upon the intrinsic spiritual power of the church, as it was exercised by the apostles, and the most pure primitive church, for the first three centuries after Christ, which is still reserved to the church: And, that this test is without prejudice to the Episcopal government of this national church, which is declared to be most agreeable to the word of God, and most suitable to monarchy, and which his majesty (as upon all occasions he hath declared) will inviolably and unalterably preserve and defend." (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 303. Burnet, vol. ii. p. 898.)

While this piece of wretched sophistry was eagerly embraced by some as a salvo to their consciences, hardened enough already by the impious oaths which from time to time they were forced to take, others fearlessly exposed the fallacy of the bishop's explanation. They argued, with the greatest reason, that such an illustration could not change the meaning of the words of this oath, more especially as the test was requir-

ed to be taken in its literal acceptation. Many of the indulged ministers were consequently deprived of their livings; a considerable number of the inferior Episcopal clergy were ejected for the same reason,\* though several of them were subsequently restored to their charges; and a few of the nobility decidedly refused to retain their situations at the expense of sacrificing their integrity.

Among the nobility who rejected the oath were the Dukes of Monmouth and Hamilton, and the Duchess of Rothes. The Earl of Queensberry, though by no means overstrict in his principles, delayed taking the test till the very last, and when he did give his oath it was with the following explanation,— “That by that part of the test declaring there lies no obligation on the swearer to endeavour any change or alteration in the government of the church or state, &c. he does not understand himself to be against alterations in case it should seem good to his majesty to make them in church or in state.”

\* According to Burnet, eighty of the best of the Episcopalian clergy refused to swear the oath. But allowing this number to be correct, though by other historians it is considerably reduced, it is to be kept in mind that many of them afterwards petitioned the council for liberty to take the oath, and were reinstated in their former livings.

Being favoured by the council, this explanation was received without any comment; but it was otherwise with the Earl of Argyle, concerning whom it will be necessary to give a more minute account.

Argyle—to whom the Duke of York had repeatedly manifested his displeasure for his speech in parliament\*—found it necessary to act with the greatest caution. He was willing to resign all his offices, rather than take the oath, but this was decidedly refused. He then waited privately on the Duke, and urged his objections to the test in a manner so forcible and convincing, that York, in a passion, replied, that “the test was brought in at first without the confession of faith; but that the president had got that confession prefixed, which rendered it now such an oath as no honest man could take!” “Then,”

\* When the Duke came to Scotland, “seeing,” says Burnet, “how great a man the Earl of Argyle was, he concluded it was necessary for him either to gain him or to ruin him. Argyle gave him all possible assurances that he would adhere to his interest in every thing except in the matters of religion; but added, that if he went to meddle with these, he owned to him freely that he would oppose him all he could. This was well enough taken in show; but Argyle said, he observed ever after such a visible coldness and distrust, that he saw what he might expect from him.”—Hist. of his Own Times, vol. ii. p. 888

said Argyle, “there is the more reason why I should advise about it.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 314.) After several fruitless applications, the Duke at length consented to allow him to take it as a privy counsellor with an explanation. Accordingly, on the 3d of November Argyle appeared in the council, and expressed himself in the following terms:—“I have considered the test, and am desirous to give obedience as far as I can. I am confident the parliament never intended to impose contradictory oaths, therefore I think no man can explain it but for himself. Accordingly, I take it in as far as it is consistent with itself and the Protestant religion; and I do declare I mean not to bind up myself in my station, and in a lawful way, to wish and endeavour any alteration I think to the advantage of the church or state, not repugnant to the Protestant religion and my loyalty; and this I understand as a part of my oath.” After giving this explanation, the test was administered, and the Duke, with a smile, ordered him, in the most gracious manner, to take his seat at the council board. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 900.) The explanatory act above noticed, drawn up by Bishop Pater-

son, was then passed; but the reasoning upon it being concluded before Argyle came in, he declined voting.

On the day following the earl was again called upon to take the test as a commissioner of the treasury. Notwithstanding the absurdity, or rather profanity of requiring the oath to be taken by the same individual for every office he held, Argyle offered to swear it anew with the former explanation, a copy of which he produced and offered to subscribe. Being removed while the council gave their opinion, he was called in and commanded to affix his signature to the paper; but being afraid of some design against him, he requested time to take it into consideration. He was then told that he had not given the satisfaction required by the act of parliament, and was immediately deprived of all his offices of trust. Argyle replied, that he conceived the parliament had excluded refusers only from places of trust; and if he were judged a refuser, though the time named by law for taking the test had not expired, he submitted, but he could not think there was any other danger in the matter; and as he had served the king faithfully within doors, so would he do so with

out, after which he withdrew. (Fountainhall's Decisions, vol. i. p. 160.)

The next morning Argyle waited on the Duke, and expressed his astonishment that what had been approved of by his highness, and received by the council at first, should now be conceived so great a crime. To which the Duke replied with a frown, "That he, with some others, had designed to bring trouble upon a handful of poor Catholics, that would live peaceably however they were used, but it should light upon others." This plain intimation of the council's resolution to proceed to extremities was followed, that very night, by a command to the earl to enter himself prisoner within the castle of Edinburgh, and an order to the king's advocate "to pursue against him a process of treason!"

With the greatest reluctance, the council allowed Sir George Lockhart to act as counsel for Argyle; but a legal opinion given by eight advocates on the earl's case, in which they maintained that the explanation given by Argyle imported no crime, so enraged the council, that a committee was appointed to examine how far that paper might be considered scandal against the government, and

deserving of prosecution. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 321.)

Argyle was brought before the justiciary court on the 12th of December. His indictment, were it not that it involved in it the life of that nobleman, was not only ridiculous, but a burlesque on common sense. What, for example, can be advanced in defence of a libel like the following? “You, Archibald, Earl of Argyle, instead of taking the test and swearing the same in the genuine sense and meaning of the words, without any equivocation, mental reservation, or evasion whatsoever, did declare against and defame the said act—declaring that you had considered the said test, and was desirous to give obedience as far as you could, whereby you clearly insinuated, that you was not able to give full obedience. You declare, that you were confident the parliament never intended to impose contradictory oaths, thereby to amuse the people with a belief, that the parliament had been so impious as really and actually to have imposed contradictory oaths. You declare that you take the test in so far only as it is consistent with itself and the Protestant religion, by which you maliciously intimate, that the said oath is

inconsistent with itself and with the Protestant religion, which is not only a downright depraving of the said act of parliament, but is likewise a misconstruing of his majesty's and the parliament's proceedings, and misrepresenting them to the people in the highest degree, and in the tenderest points they can be concerned, and implying that the king and parliament have done things inconsistent with the Protestant religion. You expressly declare, that you mean not, by taking the said test, to bind up yourself from wishing and endeavouring any alteration in a lawful way that you shall think fit for advancing of church and state; whereby you not only declare yourself, but by your example you invite others, to think themselves loosed from that obligation, and that it is free for them to make any alteration in either, as they shall think fit: Concluding your whole paper with these words, 'and this I understand as a part of my oath,' which is a treasonable invasion upon the royal legislative power, as if it were lawful for you to make to yourself an act of parliament, since he who can make any part of an act, may make the whole, the power and authority in both being the same. Of the

which crimes above mentioned, you the said Archibald, Earl of Argyle, are actor, art, and part, which being found by the assize, you ought to be punished with the pains of death, forfeiture, and escheat of lands and goods, to the terror of others to commit the like hereafter.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 320.)

Against charges so profoundly absurd, Sir George Lockhart and the other counsel for the prisoner ably defended the earl; yet all was ineffectual. The pleadings were protracted till a late hour, when the court proceeded to give judgment on the relevancy of the indictment. Two of the judges opposed, and two of them supported the sophistical reasonings of M’Kenzie, who had argued in defence of the libel. Queensberry, who presided, having taken the oath himself with an explanation, was unwilling to give the casting vote against Argyle. To accomplish their infamous purpose, therefore, Lord Nairne, an infirm old man, who had left the court before the pleadings were commenced, was raised out of bed to give his vote in a cause which involved the life or death of the noble prisoner. To supply the deficiency of his absence during the debate, the clerk was ordered to read the reasonings on either side,

during which his lordship fell fast asleep; but was awakened in sufficient time to give his vote against the earl. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 903.)

Having "sustained the charges as relevant," Argyle next day was placed at the bar of the court, a jury was chosen,\* and the trial proceeded. In consequence of the flagrant injustice which had been already committed by the prosecutors, the earl and his counsel refused to make any further defence. As usual, Sir George M'Kenzie threatened the jury with an assize of error, if they should return a verdict in favour of the prisoner. This bravado was however unnecessary, the jury being as blood-thirsty as himself. After a very short deliberation, they unanimously found, "That the Earl of Argyle hath proven against him the crimes of treason, leasing-making, and leasing-telling, and by a plurality of votes the said earl not guilty of perjury." (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 337.)

No sooner was this verdict returned than

\* The following are the names of this infamous jury, The Marquis of Montrose; the Earls of Linlithgow, Roxburgh, Dumfries, Airly, Perth, Dalhousie, and Midleton; Lords Sinclair, Lindores, and Burnt-island; Lairds Gosford and Ballymain, Park Douglas, and Claverhouse.

the council wrote to Charles, informing him of the whole proceedings, and requesting him to grant warrant for pronouncing on the earl the sentence of death. In the mean time Argyle was recommitted to the castle under a strong guard ; but aware of the dangerous situation in which he was placed, he despatched a messenger to London to learn the result of the council's application. This messenger having ascertained that the king had complied with their request, hastily left London and arrived at Edinburgh a day before the bearer of the government despatches, and communicated to Argyle the result of his mission.

Perceiving that his death was determined on, Argyle at length listened to the persuasion of his friends, and resolved to make his escape. Having accordingly disguised himself as a page to Lady Sophia Lindsay, he left the castle on the 20th of December ; and though challenged by a sentinel, reached a place of concealment undiscovered.\* As

\* "Dec. 20, 1681. This evening about nine o'clock at night, the Earl of Argyle, fearing his life might be taken, escaped out of the castle of Edinburgh, under the disguise of a page, and holding up the train of Lady Sophia Lindsay his step-daughter, and sister to the Earl of Balcaras. No punishment was inflicted on her.

might be expected, the hue and cry was immediately raised, proclamations were issued, and rewards offered for his apprehension ; but after lurking a few days in Scotland, Argyle proceeded to England, where meeting with Mr. Veitch, an ejected minister, he pursued his journey with the greatest difficulty, under the name of Mr. Hope, and arrived at London.\* He shortly afterwards proceeded to Holland.

In vain did the Countess of Argyle petition that sentence might not be passed against her husband in his absence. The lords, overawed by the council, pronounced against him the sentence following :—“The lords commissioners of justiciary decree and adjudge Archibald, earl of Argyle, to be executed to the death, demeaned as a traitor, and to undergo the pains of treason, and other punishment appointed by the laws of the kingdom, when he shall be apprehended, at such time and place, and in such a manner, as his majesty, in his royal pleasure, shall think fit to

Casuists do allow one to fly when he meets with injustice.” Fountainhall’s, *Decisions*, vol. i. p. 167. Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 337.

\* See an interesting account of the earl’s escape and journey, in Dr. M’Crie’s *Memoirs of Veitch*.

declare and appoint ; and his name, meemory, and honours, to be extinct, and his arms to be riven forth and delete from the book of arms, so that his posterity may never have place, nor be able hereafter to bruik or enjoy any honours, offices, titles, or dignities, within this realm in time coming ; and to have forfeited, amitted, and tint all and sundry his lands, &c. to our sovereign lord, to remain perpetually with his highness in property.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 340.)

Proceedings so outrageous—opposed as they were to all law, justice, or even common decency—filled every reflecting mind in both kingdoms with horror. In England the transaction was openly reprobated. “ I am not acquainted with the Scots’ law,” said Lord Halifax to the king, “ but the English law would not have hanged a dog for such a crime.” (Fountainhall’s Diary, p. 21.) And Lord Clarendon, on hearing of the sentence blessed God that he lived not in a country where there were such laws.

The consternation in Scotland, especially among the Presbyterians, was universal. Several of the nobility who had refused the test abandoned the country and sought refuge in exile. Even the moderate Episco-

pilians were alarmed, perceiving that neither rectitude nor loyalty could save the individual devoted to destruction by a popish prince and his base sycophants. It may, however, give some relief to the reader amidst such a display of injustice and cruelty, to produce an example—ludicrous enough indeed—of the public feeling, which, though displayed by boys only was a galling satire on this disgraceful trial. In a very curious and valuable work, entitled “Historical and Descriptive Account of George Heriot’s Hospital,” an adventure of the boys of that institution is recorded from an old MS. by way of a “testimony” against the folly and oppressive nature of the test. The absurd reasoning of the crown lawyers on Argyle’s trial having become a subject of merriment to the boys, they determined to institute a similar process against the *dog* which guarded the outer gate, as being possessed of a *public office*, provided he refused to take the test. A copy of the oath was consequently tendered to this sagacious functionary, who, after smelling, refused to taste it. It was then rubbed over with butter, rolled up, and again laid before him. He took it into his mouth, but, instead of swallowing it entire, he extracted the but-

ter and spat out the paper on the ground. In imitation of Sir George M'Kenzie, one of the boys, as king's advocate, said, "that this was the test, and that all his irksome champing and chewing of it, was only, if possible, to separate the concomitant nutriment, and that was mikel worse than ane flat refusal ; and, gif it were rightly examined, wold, upon tryal, be found not lesse than leiseing-making." After a protracted but ludicrous trial, the dog was brought in guilty of "leasing-making," which was exactly Argyle's sentence, and, like that nobleman, he was condemned to suffer death. "As the lounes were removing him from court to prison ther chanced a curat to be present, who asked, what was the matter ? What ailed them at the dog ? One of the limmers answered, that he, being in public trust, was required to take the test, and both refused it and abused it, whereupon he was to be hanged. The curat storming said, they deserved all to be hanged for such presumptuous mockery : The lounes laughing aloud, cryed out with one consent, that he and his brethren deserved better to be hanged than any of them, or the tyke either, since they had swallowed that which the

tyke had refused.”\* It would appear that the dog escaped,† but this juvenile transaction was sufficient to have put the persecutors to utter confusion, had one spark of feeling remained in their breasts.

If the supporters of government, on the slightest symptoms of dissatisfaction at the arbitrary measures of the council, were thus cruelly used, what must have been the lot of those few but undaunted patriots, who set at defiance all their unhallowed and bloody laws? The death of Cargill had completely put a stop to field-preaching, no minister as yet daring to tread in his footsteps. Deprived of public ordinances, the people formed themselves into small societies for prayer and religious conference. They assembled, usually at night, in the most sequestered parts of the country, where they not only sung the praises of God, and called on his name by prayer, but encouraged and exhorted one another to

\* “Account of the Arraignment, tryal, escape and condemnation of the Dog of Heriot’s Hospital, that was supposed to have been hanged, but did at last slip the halter.” *Historical Account of George Heriot’s Hospital*, p. 21.

† A no less curious proclamation was drawn up by the boys, pretty similar to that published against Argyll, “forsaulting his estat, discharging all persons to reset or harbor the fugitive trator,” and offering £500 for his apprehension. *Ibid*, p. 24.

steadfastness and perseverance in the cause of Christ.

"No more

The assembled people dared, in face of day,  
To worship God, or even at the dead  
Of night, save where the wintry storm raved fierce,  
And thunder peals compelled the men of blood  
To couch within their dens."\*

For the more effectual preservation of Christian intercourse and mutual edification in the absence of a stated ministry, these meetings nominated deputies to attend a general meeting, which was empowered to adopt such measures as the exigency of the times required. The first meeting of these united societies was held on the 15th of December, at Logan House, in the parish of Lesmahago, Lanarkshire, where it was resolved to draw up a public testimony against the defection and danger of the times. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 10. *Life of Renwick*, p. 49.) After long reasoning, a testimony was framed, which—considering the sufferings to which they were subjected, the unenviable situation in which they were placed, and the dismal prospect which presented itself concerning religion and liberty in the kingdom—was just what might have been expected from

\* *Graham's Sabbath, &c.*

men, driven almost to despair. "Although we ought to take in good part," say they in that paper, "whatever God, in his infinite wisdom, hath, for the punishment of our sins, carved out unto us, and eye and acknowledge him alone in it; and though we always ought to acknowledge government and governors as ordained by him, in so far as they rule and govern according to the rules set down by him in his word and the constitutive laws of the nation, and ought to cast the mantle of love on the lesser errors of governors, and give the best countenance to their administration that the nature of their actions will bear, yet when all these laws, both of God and the kingdom, conditional and constitutive of the government, are cased and annulled, by pretended laws, and the highest of usurpation, and an inexplicable prerogative in matters civil is arrogant: when a banner of impiety, profaneness, and atheism, is avowedly displayed against the heavens, &c. what shall the people do in such an extremity? Should they give their reason as men, their consciences as Christians, and resign their liberties, fortunes, religion, and their all, to those who in spite of God and man, are resolved to make their

own will the absolute and sovereign rule of their actions? Shall the end of government be lost, through the weakness, wickedness, and tyranny of governors? Must the people, by an implicit submission and deplorable stupidity destroy themselves, and betray their posterity, and become objects of reproach to the present generation, and pity and contempt to the future?\* Have they not, in such an extremity, good ground to make use of that natural and radical power they have, to shake off that yoke which neither we nor our forefathers were able to bear?" Having then enumerated all the tyrannical and base deeds of Charles, whom they designate "the now cast off tyrant," they add, "Is it any wonder, considering such dealings, and many thousands more, that true Scotsmen (though we have been always, and even to extremity sometimes, loyal to our kings) should, after twenty years' tyranny, break out at last, as we have done, and put in practice that power which God and nature hath given us, and we have reserved to ourselves? Let none, therefore, object against the legality of what

\* Let all those who esteem the persecuted Covenanters as ignorant enthusiasts, who knew not, and cared not for the blessings of *civil liberty*, answer these reasonings, as well as those which follow.

we have done, or are doing ; for we offer (as how inconsiderable we are said to be) to prove ourselves to have done nothing against our ancient laws, civil or ecclesiastical, against any lawyers or divines whatsoever, our ancient laws being judges ;—for we are only endeavouring to extricate ourselves from under a tyrannous yoke, and to reduce our church and state to what they were in the years 1648 and 1649. We, therefore, here convened, in our name and authority, ratify and approve what hath been done by the Rutherglen and Sanquhar Declarations ; and do, by these presents, rescind, annul, and make void, whatsoever hath been done by Charles Stuart, or his accomplices, in prejudice to our ancient laws and liberties, in all the several pretended and prelimited parliaments and conventions since the year 1660. And particularly the late parliament, holden at Edinburgh, the 28th July, 1681, by a commissioner professedly popish ; and for villany exiled his native land, with all the acts and laws there statute and enacted ; as that abominable, ridiculous, unparalleled, and soul-perjuring test, and the rest.” (Informatory Vindication, pp. 91—96. Hind Let Loose, p. 158.)

This paper being read to the delegates, was unanimously approved of, and appointed to be published at Lanark on the 12th of January following. Accordingly, about forty armed men proceeded to that town on the day appointed, where, having publicly burnt the test-act, they solemnly read the declaration, and affixed a copy of it to the market-cross. The declaration was condemned by the greater part of the Presbyterian ministers, not only on account of its framers again renouncing the authority of Charles, but of arrogating to themselves powers in it to which they had no claim. That there are exceptionable expressions in it must be evident to every reader; but it ought to be noticed, that these expressions were seen and acknowledged by the society people themselves shortly afterwards, and renounced in their Informatory Vindication, (Faithful Contentings, p. 11,) which, considering their sufferings, ought to be received as a sufficient apology for one or two instances of unguarded language.\*

No sooner did intelligence of this publication reach Edinburgh, than the council—

\* Such as their calling themselves a Convention of Estates.

enraged at so daring a protest against all their tyrannical laws, as well as contempt for their authority—ordered the magistrates to burn the Lanark declaration, together with the solemn league and covenant, by the hands of the common hangman; which was accordingly performed with the greatest ceremony at the cross. The town of Lanark was at the same time fined in six thousand merks, for not hindering what it was impossible for them to prevent—the publication of this galling declaration. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 12.)

But not only were the society people the objects of persecution; Presbyterians in general were diligently sought after, and such of them as fell into the hands of the council—however innocent of the crimes laid to their charge—were not suffered to escape unpunished. One example, at present, of the unjust procedure of the council will be sufficient. Among the ministers who refused the indulgence was Mr. Frazer of Brae, who, as formerly noticed, (*Vide vol. i. pp. 285—287,*) had been examined, and for non-conformity sent to the Bass. On application to the council, he was liberated after the battle of Bothwell, under a bond of five thou-

sand merks given by Sir Hugh Campbell of Calder for his appearance when required. Since that period he had continued to preach in houses as privately as possible, that he might give no offence; but being informed against as having kept conventicles, he was cited before the council. Finding however that the charge was unfounded, the matter for the present was suffered to drop; and Mr. Frazer repaired to the north country. Being there attacked by disease, Sir Hugh proposed to write to the Bishop of Edinburgh, informing him of Mr. Frazer's indisposition, and his innocence as to holding field conventicles. Though Mr. Frazer remonstrated against this unwise measure—seeing it would afford an opportunity to the council to renew the citation with the view of obtaining the five thousand merks—Sir Hugh, relying on the justice of his cause, sent a letter of the above import to the bishop. As Mr. Frazer predicted, the citation was instantly renewed, and both principal and cautioner were ordered to appear before the council on the 22d December.

Notwithstanding his indisposition, and the inclemency of the season, Mr. Frazer resolved to obey the citation, and arrived at

Edinburgh the day before the time appointed for his appearance. When he and his cautioner presented themselves at the bar, the council were so astonished, that a dead silence ensued, which was at length broken by an order to the clerk to read Mr. Frazer's indictment. In this libel he was accused of preaching in the fields and without authority, and of teaching pernicious and rebellious principles. No proof was adduced against him, but, as usual, the whole charges were referred to his oath. Having obtained liberty to speak, Mr. Frazer assured them that he had not preached in the fields since he came from the Bass, nor yet without authority ; that he had never preached seditious principles, nor doctrines inconsistent with the Scriptures and the confession of faith composed in the reign of James VI., which he conceived the last parliament had ratified ; that he acknowledged magistracy as an ordinance of God, and owned the king's authority, even in ecclesiastical matters, as the nursing father of the church. He concluded by expressing in the mildest terms his adherence to Presbyterian church government, and declaring that as to his conduct ' he had endeavoured to keep a good conscience

both towards God and man, living unblamably and peaceably, and giving to God what was God's, and to Cæsar what was Cæsar's."

After delivering this speech, he was asked whether he had preached since he was released from the Bass? To which he replied, that he begged leave to answer to what he was charged with in the indictment only, which he humbly conceived was, whether he had preached without authority and seditiously; and that he denied. The council then asked by whom he was ordained. "He had no freedom," he replied, "to answer that question, seeing it concerned others whom he was not to stage; but he assured them, his ordainers had lawful and good authority; and he supposed their lordships could not compel him to answer to that, neither was he obliged, seeing he had been formerly questioned on the same point, and had satisfied the law, and therefore could not be again tried for the same fault. And seeing his ordination to preach was before the act of grace, any crime therein (if any was) was now purged; and, in a word, this was not in his indictment." (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 273.)

Several of the members of council were so convinced of his innocence, that they sig-

nified their wish that he should be discharged. But this was decidedly opposed by the prelates, who contended that he was a dangerous person and ought to be punished. At length the following decision was acquiesced in : That Mr. Frazer "be sent to Blackness prison, there to continue till he paid his fine of five thousand merks, and give surety either to preach no more, or go off the kingdom." When the Duke of York returned to London next year, application was made by Mr. Frazer's friends for his release, upon finding security that he should leave the country. With great reluctance this request was complied with, and Mr. Frazer immediately afterwards repaired to England. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 110.)

## CHAPTER V.

Oppression increases—the Duke of York applauded by the prelates—trial and execution of William Harvey military inquisition—proceedings of the council—case of Robert Gray—meeting at Tweedsmuir—violent proclamation against the Covenanters—inhuman conduct of the military—examples—trial and execution of James Robertson, John Finlay, and William Cochrane—their reasons for refusing to say “God save the king”—consistency of the Covenanters—case of Alexander Hume of Hume—of William Martin of Dallurg—of William Lawrie of Blackwood—of John Nisbet, younger—enlarged powers granted to the military commissioners—instructions to the curates—the Rye-house plot—other executions—field-preaching revived by Mr. Renwick.

ALTHOUGH the number of Covenanters who sealed their testimony with their blood, was much smaller during 1682 than in the year preceding, similar, or rather increased, oppressions continued to be the lot of all who did not join heart and hand in support of prelacy and popery. The more effectually to accomplish their infamous purpose of annihilating the Presbyterians, the council, on the 27th of January, ordered Claverhouse to proceed to Galloway with a troop of horse, to punish at discretion all whom he suspected of disaffection; and on the 30th he received a commission, as sheriff of Wigton, to make a summary ecclesiastical reformation in Kirkcudbright, Annandale, Wigton, and

Dumfries. So rigorously did this champion for tyranny execute his orders, that the council conferred on him a vote of thanks for his zeal against the Presbyterians. Their applause was no doubt exceedingly flattering to this ambitious hero ; but the spoils of the Covenanters were much more gratifying to his avarice, and proved a more substantial reward for his services. Similar powers were granted to Major White and the Laird of Meldrum in Lanarkshire, which were executed with equal rigour. In short, in every county throughout the kingdom the most disgraceful and cruel proceedings were carried on against such as entertained the smallest attachment to the Presbyterian faith.

During these transactions, Charles, having got rid of his English parliament, recalled the Duke of York to London. Devotedly attached to this popish persecutor, the Scottish prelates, immediately after his departure, sent a letter, dated 9th March, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, highly applauding the measures pursued in Scotland by the duke. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 907.) "We should prove very defective in duty and gratitude," say they, "if upon this occasion we should forget to acknowledge to your grace how much

this poor church and our order do owe to his princely care and goodness, that his majesty and the worthy bishops of England may from you receive the just account thereof. Since his royal highness's coming to this kingdom, we find our case much changed to the better, and our church and order (which, through the cunning and power of their adversaries, were exposed to extreme hazard and contempt,) sensibly relieved and rescued ; which, next to the watchful providence of God (that mercifully superintends his church) we can ascribe to nothing so much as to his royal highness's gracious owning and vigilant protection of us. Upon all occasions he gives fresh instances of his eminent zeal against the most unreasonable schism. The peace and tranquillity of this kingdom is the effect of his prudent and steady conduct of affairs, and the humours of our wicked fanatics are much restrained from dangerous eruptions, upon their apprehensions of his vigilance and justice ; for they dread nothing so much as to see him upon the head of his majesty's councils and forces against them.”  
(Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 365.)

While the prelates were attributing the stability of their church to the zeal of a pro-

fessed papist, the council continued to cement it with the blood of the Covenanters. On the 20th of February, William Harvey was indicted before the justiciary court, for "being accessory to the late rebellion, and being present at the publication of the declaration at Lanark." Though a verdict of guilty was returned against him by the jury, the court delayed pronouncing sentence till commanded to do so by the council, when this poor but pious Covenanter was condemned to be executed at Lanark on the 3d of March. In his dying testimony, which is very short, he declares that he adhered to the Scriptures, the confession of faith, and the national and solemn league and covenants; to the government and governors, in so far as they were a terror to evil doers, and an encouragement to those that do well; and to all the faithful testimonies given by the people of God since the year 1660. "Likewise," he adds, "I bear my testimony against popery and Prelacy, profanity and ungodliness, and all abominations, and punishing of the godly, and letting blasphemy and wickedness go free; and I seal my testimony against the dreadful test, and all the sinful engagements of them. As for my dear friends I warn

you all to flee under Christ's banner in this day of common calamity, for there is no shelter but under his wings. I desire you, my loving wife, to seek God through Christ, and to own him in his way and truth, for which I suffer. Now, I recommend you and my child to the only wise Lord, who hath promised to be a husband to the widow, and a father to the fatherless." (Scots Worthies, p. 428.) After praying on the scaffold, the sentence was executed, and this martyr fell a sacrifice to the council's resentment for the last declaration at Lanark.

The Duke of York paid his last visit to Scotland in the beginning of May, for the purpose, chiefly, of placing the administration of affairs in that kingdom in the hands of his devoted friends. Queensberry was accordingly appointed treasurer; the lord president, created Earl of Aberdeen, chancellor; and Perth, justice-general. The Duke took his final leave of the council on the 15th of that month, after recommending to them the suppression of the Presbyterians, especially in Clydesdale, Tiviotdale, Fife, and Ayrshire, whither he advised them to send additional troops. In return, the council thanked him for the excellent pattern of

government he had left them, begged the continuance of his kindness, as one of the greatest blessings they could enjoy ; and promised their constant and firm adherence to his service upon every occasion. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 366.)

Agreeably to the instructions received from the Duke, the new administration proceeded to execute summary vengeance on the Presbyterians. Dalyell was ordered to repair to Lanark and Ayr with a considerable number of troops, to search for, and punish, those who were suspected to be rebels, or disaffected to the government either in church or state. He was ordered to compel every individual, whether innocent or guilty, to attend his own parish church ; and “to fall upon ways to know if any of the rebels’ estates, and rents, and movables, be possessed by their wives, children, or friends, to their behoof, and to send in lists of any guilty of such contrivances.” With Dalyell were associated the Earl of Dumfries and Claverhouse, who received a general commission to plunder and imprison at discretion. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 113.)

Nor were the council themselves less active in persecuting to death those prisoners

whom their numerous agents put into their hands. Robert Gray, an Englishman, who had been seized and imprisoned in the preceding summer, upon what pretext is unknown, was brought before a committee of council on the 13th of May. While in prison, he had written a letter to John Anderson, then prisoner at Dumfries, expressing his sentiments respecting the king—whom he denominated a tyrant—and calling the oath, lately enjoined to be sworn, by the name of the *black test*. When examined by the council concerning this letter, he acknowledged that he was the writer of it, and that his sentiments, therein expressed, remained unchanged. He was consequently brought before the justiciary court on the 17th, found guilty on his own confession, and condemned to be executed on the 19th, in the Grass-market. While in prison he wrote an interesting testimony, in which he says, “I have got my sentence of death from men, who are unjustly taking away my life, merely for adhering to my principles, and have no matter of fact to prove against me, but only adhering to the truths of Jesus Christ, and testifying against their sinful laws and actions, which my indictment will testify. They take away my

life for declining their authority, and calling Charles Stuart a tyrant, and speaking against their test that they have made to overturn the whole work of reformation, in calling it the *black test*. Now, many may condemn me, and no doubt do, in my writing that letter to John Anderson, whom I own as my brother in Christ :—I do not much care what the time-servers say ; but I hope none of the zealous exercised Christians in the land, that are concerned with the wrongs done to their Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, will do it ; I having a right call to do what I did, he writing to me, and I giving him an answer, in which I have great peace, notwithstanding it has brought me upon the trial, and my God has owned me in it.” When on the scaffold, he addressed the spectators in a short speech. “ I am brought out of another nation,” said he, “ to own that covenant which ye have broken, and to seal it, and the glorious work of reformation, with my blood. The Lord be judge between me and you who have taken away my life, which of us have been in the wrong to the other ; and assure yourselves there is wrath, sad wrath, hanging over this city, for the innocent blood shed therein. But as for you, who are the rem-

nant of the Lord's people, I would say this to you, keep your ground, and beware of turning aside to one hand or another, and I will assure you, the Lord will prepare a Zoar for you." (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 195, et seq. Scots Worthies, pp. 393, 399.)

Notwithstanding the continuance and severity of the persecution, a general meeting of delegates from the united societies was held at Talla-lin, Tweedsmuir, on the 15th of June. Although nothing material was done at this meeting—excepting their laudable efforts to purify their societies of James Russel and a few other members who were tinctured with the Gibbite opinions—yet, by exhortation and prayer, the sufferers were encouraged to perseverance in the cause which they had espoused. (Faithful Contendings, p. 21.) On the other hand, this meeting brought down upon themselves, and upon all Presbyterians throughout the country, the vengeance of the persecutors. The curate of the parish having maliciously represented them as a large armed assembly,\* the council, on the 8th of July, issued a most violent proclamation, from which we shall

\* There were only between twenty and thirty present, and of these, not a fourth part had weapons.

give an extract, as a specimen of their unreasonable and cruel proceedings:—" Of late, some traitors, runagates, and fugitives," say they, " have convocate towards the number of eighty, with forbidden weapons, near to Talla-lin, in the shire of Peebles; and the people in that country have been so defective in the duties of loyal subjects, or good countrymen, as to neglect giving timeous notice of such meetings or actings, either to our council, the sheriff of the shire, or the commanders of our forces; and this neglect of theirs, being not only a breach of duty in them but of very bad example and dangerous consequence;—we, therefore, do hereby strictly require and command all the subjects and inhabitants within this our kingdom, whether in burgh or land, upon knowledge or information that any number of men do convocate unlawfully in arms, or appear in company in any place, or where any one or two of such, as are declared traitors or fugitives from our laws, on treasonable accounts, shall repair, that they shall with all diligence give intimation thereof—with certification, if they fail, that they shall be held and repute as disaffected to our government and service. And we hereby of new intimate to all our

subjects, that whoever shall intercommune with, reset, supply, shelter, or give any comfort to any declared traitors or fugitives, or who shall conceal, reset, or shelter any who do convocate—that such resetters or assisters shall be proceeded against as if they were guilty of the crimes whereof these traitors and fugitives are guilty, according to the just rigour of our laws.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 376.)

Perceiving, however, that this violent proclamation was not so carefully attended to by the magistrates as the council had enjoined, they issued commissions on the 3d of August to military officers to confer with the sheriffs and other authorities; to call before them every person suspected of withdrawing from ordinances, &c. and to pronounce sentence and order immediate execution, with or without the concurrence of the magistrates. By this commission the executive power was placed in the hands of the military, whose revolting cruelty spread terror and dismay throughout every part of the country. (Faithful Contendings, p. 25.)

To give a detail of the severities which in one county alone were committed on the people by these military judges, would be a painful task. We shall select, as a speci-

men, a few instances in various parts of the country, in all which, it will be observed, the curates either were the promoters, or took an active part. Courts were held in Galloway and Nithsdale by David Graham, before which multitudes were summoned, and, without regard to age or sex, fined, imprisoned, or banished, according to the arbitrary sentence of the judge. Husbands were forced to give bond for their wives, and parents for their children, that they should either oblige them to attend the church, or drive them from their houses, and refuse to show them the smallest pity. If any of the parishioners presumed to meet together for prayer, the curate informed against them as being guilty of holding conventicles, and soldiers were immediately quartered upon every house, who oppressed, wounded, and robbed the inmates with impunity.

In the parish of St. Mungo, in Annandale, a boy of sixteen years of age having been summoned before Cornet Graham, but not appearing, a party of soldiers was quartered upon his father, though a regular hearer of the curate. In addition to this severity, the old man was cited to appear before Graham next court lay, and commanded to subscribe

a bond, obliging himself “never to reset, converse with, countenance, or in any way supply his own son.” So unnatural a mandate was justified by the curate, who observed, “that it was fit and reasonable, the father should suffer for his son, who was but a child, and his parents ought to have made him regular by a bridle.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. pp. 384, 385.)

Claverhouse, too, was exceedingly active in the work of persecution. Having seized four men in the parish of New Glenluce, who refused to hear the curate, he imprisoned them in Stranraer, and quartered a party of ten or twelve of the military upon each of their families. One of these parties acted a most outrageous part. Though supplied with every thing which the house could afford, they ordered the afflicted wife to go out on the Sabbath day, and kill and make ready two sheep for their dinner. This demand being refused, one of the ruffians seized her, and swore that he would roast her on the fire, which he was prevented from doing only by the interference of the rest of the family. Having spoiled the houses of every thing on which they could lay their hands, the soldiers, after twelve weeks’ residence,

marched elsewhere ; at which time, the four prisoners were set on barebacked horses, tied two and two together, and ordered to be conveyed to Edinburgh. When a considerable way on their journey, Claverhouse sent his servant after them, offering them their liberty, provided they subscribed a bond, promising to pay to him on demand, the sum of one thousand merks each ! To this unreasonable demand they were obliged to yield, and were permitted to return home, to be again robbed and plundered in the year following.\* The fines, indeed, which were extorted from rich and poor, almost exceed belief. Because the Lady of Douglas would not swear that she had not attended a conventicle since 1679, she was fined in £500, and imprisoned two years in Stirling castle.

In Lanarkshire the people were not less grievously oppressed. One of the most violent of the persecutors in that county was the provost of Rutherglen. This Episcopal champion despatched a party to the house of a poor widow, to apprehend her son for absenting

\* Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 385.—From this anecdote, which is one of many of a similar kind, the reader is left to judge whether there be any truth in the assertion, that Claverhouse “would scorn to rob any private individual of a farthing!”—So says a modern writer.

himself from church; but the young man, aware of his fate, made a desperate effort, and escaped out of their hands. Disappointed of his prey, the provost ordered the sister to be apprehended, alleging that she was accessory to her brother's escape, fined her in thirty pounds, and threw her into prison. Nor was she permitted to visit her parent, whose grief had laid her on a sick-bed, though sufficient caution was offered by her friends. Nay, the pitiful persecutor again surprised the house of the widow at midnight, under pretence of searching for her son, and before leaving it, compelled her to give him twenty merks—nearly all her living! (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 131.)

But the inhumanity of the oppressors was not confined to deeds of extortion; they added the most revolting cruelty to avarice, and acted a part which would puzzle the most inveterate Tory writer to vindicate. In the parish of Kilbride, for example, Captain Inglis having seized three countrymen, who refused to swear the oath which he was pleased to dictate, deliberately tortured them by means of lighted matches bound between their fingers, till they were deprived of the use of their hands. Inglis then repaired to

the house of a widow Mack, with the intention of apprehending her son ; but the young man having made his escape, the captain collected the whole inhabitants of the district, and tendered to each of them the following oath :—“ By the eternal God, and as I am content to lose my part in heaven, I know not where John Mack is.” One individual refusing to swear so impious an oath, Inglis and his men beat him with their guns and swords, till they left him for dead ! (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 388.)

One example more will be sufficient, and more than sufficient, to show the cruelty of the persecutors, and the truly wretched condition of the Presbyterians. Captain Inglis, in searching for a man who was accused of the dreadful crime of non-conformity, and who fortunately happened to be from home, seized a boy in his employment of fifteen years of age, and commanded him to swear whether or not he knew where his master was to be found. This oath being refused by the boy, the brutal military struck him with their swords, and wounded him in several parts of the body. They then dragged him by the hair to the fire, and held his face so near that his eyes almost started from

their sockets. After having again cut him with their swords, they left him for dead, bleeding in every part of his body. Contrary to expectation, he afterwards recovered ; but for several years he was bereft of reason, in consequence of the inhuman treatment which he had received. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 389.)

As already noticed, all these barbarities were committed at the instance, and commonly under the eye of the curates. These *reverend* gentlemen regularly visited their parishioners, not to instruct or comfort, but to take down the names of those who absented themselves from church, who assembled together for prayer, or who kept family worship ! All who acted so *puritanically* were noted down as disaffected Presbyterians, and reported to the military as fit objects to be reclaimed by torture or death. (Wodrow, vol. iii. pp. 386, 387.) But the heart sickens at the bare recital of such atrocities. Let the enemies of the Covenanters justify these persecutors as they may, their deeds will be held in everlasting execration by all who retain in their breasts the smallest spark of humanity.

The cruelties of the military, and their

abettors, the curates, were eclipsed by those of the council, who continued to sacrifice one victim after another to civil and ecclesiastical despotism. On the 11th of December, James Robertson, John Finlay, and William Cochrane, were brought before the judiciary court, charged with the usual crimes of non-conformity, and denying the authority of the government in ecclesiastical matters. James Robertson was a pedlar, and belonged to Stonehouse, in Lanarkshire. Being in Kilmarnock on business in October, he resolved to visit his acquaintance, Finlay, then lying in prison; but no sooner did he enter the jail than he was apprehended and brought before Major White, who at that time commanded in the district. No crime being laid to his charge, the major examined him in the usual ensnaring manner; and when Robertson refused to answer questions criminating himself, the major pulled him by the nose and wrung it till the blood gushed out. He was then committed to prison: but even there, when engaged in the worship of God with a fellow prisoner, the captain of the guards rushed in, seized his bible, and swore he would commit it to the flames, if he ever found him engaged in a similar exercise. In

a few weeks afterwards he was conveyed to Edinburgh. At Linlithgow, because he refused to drink the king's health when ordered; he was tied head and feet together, and left lying on the cold ground in that miserable posture. Next day he was cruelly bound on a bare-backed horse, carried to Edinburgh, and hurried before the council. From his examination we shall select the following extract, in his own words, from which it will appear evident, that however cautious a prisoner's answers might be, nothing could save him but a complete renunciation of his principles.—“*Q.* Is the king your lawful prince ? *A.* Since ye make your questions matters of life and death, ye ought to give time to deliberate upon them; but seeing I am put to it, I answer, ‘as he is a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well,’ he is, or is not. *Q.* Were Pentland and Bothwell acts of traitory ? *A.* They being in their own defence and the defence of the gospel, they were not acts of traitory and rebellion, self-defence being always lawful, which I prove from the confession of faith, whereon you ground yourselves, in that article, which is that subjects may resist unjust violence and tyranny. *Q.* Was you at Bothwell bridge ?

*A.* Ye count it an act of traitory and also of rebellion; bear witness of it, and so make it evident. *Q.* Purge yourself by oath, and so we offer to set you at liberty. *A.* I will say no more of it; for when I told the truth to some of you, it was not believed. *Q.* There was an act of parliament when the confession of faith was made, declaring that the king was supreme, and it was owned by the Presbyterians at that time. *A.* How could that be owned, seeing the confession itself was owned? Show me the act. But it was not produced. *Q.* Was the bishop's death murder? *A.* When I am a judge set upon the bench, I shall pass sentence thereupon. *Q.* Own you the Lanark and Sanquhar Declarations? *A.* I cannot own any thing till I see and consider it. *Q.* Do you keep your parish kirk? *A.* If the minister has aught to challenge me with, let him do it. *Q.* Now, as a test of your loyalty, will you say, God save the king? *A.* Prayer ought to be gone about with composure and deliberation, and I am not in a composure for it. *Q.* Would you not seek a blessing if at meat? *A.* If you were present you would see. (Scots Worthies, p. 400.)

The examination of John Finlay, the pri-

soner who was visited in Kilmarnock jail by Robertson, was very short. “ Being interrogated, whether it be lawful to rise in arms against the king, he refuses to answer, these being kettle questions, and he a poor prisoner. Refuses to say ‘ God save the king,’ but says he loves the king as well as any person. Confesseth he was present at Drumclog, but without arms. Being asked if he conversed with Mr. Donald Cargill within these two years, refuses to answer, otherwise than that a man is neither by the law of God nor man bound to have a hand in shedding his own blood.” William Cochrane’s examination was nearly the same with that of Finlay. When urged, however, to say “ God save the king,” he made no reply.

The confessions of these three prisoners being produced before the court, as sufficient evidence against them, they were found guilty, and condemned to be executed on the 15th of December. When they appeared on the scaffold, Robertson attempting to speak to the people, orders were given to beat the drums; and because the dying man ventured to complain, Johnston, the town-major, beat him in a most brutal and cruel manner with his cane, at the foot of the ladder. In the

testimony which he left behind him, how ever, he gives the following reasons for his refusing to utter the prayer "God save the king." "The using of these words," says he, "we find was the order that was used in and among the children of Israel, at the king's anointing to that office ; and used in our own nation at the coronation. Now, this being only due to a lawful king, ought not to be given but to a lawful king, and so not to him, being a degenerate tyrant ; for if I should, I thereby had said *Amen* to all that he hath done against the church and liberties thereof, and to all his oppression by unlawful exactions, and raising of armies, for no other effect but to deprive us of the hearing of the gospel, and troubling or molesting the subjects, both in their consciences and external liberties, and also their bloodshed and murders made upon the people of God, and so 'bid him God speed,' contrary to that in 2 John, 10th verse. And seeing it cannot be given to any that have thus used their power to a wrong end, in such a measure and manner ; so much less when they have set him up as an idol, in the room of God incarnate." Similar sentiments were expressed by William Cochrane. "The main

article in my indictment," said he, "upon which I have received my sentence of death from men, was, that I would not say 'God save the king,' which I could not do without being guilty of saying *Amen* to all that he hath done against the church and people of God and true subjects of the kingdom, and the ancient and fundamental laws thereof." "I durst not use these words," said John Finlay; "their bidding us to do it in test of our loyalty, to save him in his person and government and authority, which is a perfect owning of him in all that he hath done, in his usurpation upon Christ's prerogatives and privileges, they having made him supreme head in all matters and causes, civil and ecclesiastic." (Cloud of Witnesses. Scots Worthies.) The death of these three martyrs made a deep and lasting impression on many of the spectators, and proved the means, under God, of leading them to embrace that faith which it was the unwearied aim of the government to destroy.

Many historians have accused the Covenanters of foolishly and madly throwing away their lives by scrupulously refusing to say at the command of their judges, "God save the king." But in addition to the

grounds of their refusal, as stated by the three sufferers noticed above, we would ask, Did not that prayer include in it an unqualified submission to the king, in his person, government, and laws? And did it not express a desire for the blessing of God to rest upon all those measures by which the religion and laws of the kingdom were overturned and suppressed? As such it was understood by the council and lords of judiciary: and how then was it possible for the Covenanters to repeat it at the mandate of an atheistical junto, and retain either their principles or their integrity? That the Covenanters were not, however, actuated by such narrow views and unfounded prejudices as the apologists of persecution would have us to believe, is not more evident from their own definition of the words, as already shown, than from that of both adversaries and friends. Even Hume acknowledges that when "their lives were offered them if they would say 'God save the king,' they would only agree to pray for his *repentance.*" (History of England, vol. viii. p. 170.) "I do not remember that ever I conversed with one of the sufferers," says a correspondent introduced by Wodrow, "and I talked with

most or all who suffered until August, 1685, who scrupled to pray for the king in their own terms, for *repentance* and *salvation to his soul.*" Nay, that author adduces an example which distinctly shows the intention of government in enforcing this prayer. Mr. Campbell being asked by Lieutenant-colonel Windram, "if he would pray for the king," replied, that he both did and would, that God would give him a godly life here, and a life of glory hereafter. "That is not enough," rejoined Windram, "you must pray for king Charles II., as he is supreme over all persons and causes, ecclesiastic as well as civil." (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 49.) "Praying for the king," says M'Gavin, "was enforced at the point of the bayonet, and compliance was understood by both parties to be a renouncing of a fundamental principle of the Scottish reformation, which incurred the guilt of both hypocrisy and perjury. Charles was not content with being acknowledged head of the state. He would be head of the church too; and James, his successor, would have resigned the headship of both to the pope." (Life of John Brown, p. 16.)

The last public execution in 1682 was that of Alexander Hume of Hume, whose

condemnation was so illegal that Wodrow pronounces it to be “one of the most flaming instances of the rigour of that period.” (Hist., vol. iii. p. 416.) On the 15th of November he was indicted for “rising in rebellion against the king’s majesty within the shires of Roxburgh, Berwick, Selkirk, and Peebles, in marching up and down in arms, rendezvousing with the rebels in Bewly-edge, resisting and fighting a party of his majesty’s forces, under the command of the master of Ross, besieging the castle of Hawick, robbing the arms therein, and marching towards Bothwell-bridge.” Notwithstanding the efforts of M’Kenzie, the innocence of the prisoner was so clearly established, that the prosecution was dropped. Instead, however, of being dismissed, he was recommitted to prison; and, on the 20th of December, again brought to trial. In his second indictment he was accused of having come to the house of Sir Henry M’Dowal of Mackerston, besieged it, and called for horse and arms; of having come armed to Kelso, Selkirk, and Hawick, and searched for horses and arms, carrying away colours, drums, &c. and of marching forward to join the rebels at Bothwell. None of these charges were proven,

excepting that of his being at Mackerston house, which he declared to be quite accidental, having gone there for the purpose of buying a horse, and no person accompanying him but only one servant. This he offered to prove by several witnesses; but the court—determined to secure his estate—would allow no exculpatory proof to be adduced. The jury having accordingly found him guilty of commanding a party of the rebels' horse, and besieging the castle of Hawick—though none of the witnesses had accused him of these crimes—he was condemned to be executed on the 29th of December. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 908.)

Mr. Hume earnestly entreated a few days' delay of his execution, that he might have time to lay his case before the king; but this was peremptorily refused. Several of his friends in London, however, anticipating the result of the trial, procured for him a pardon, and despatched a messenger with it to Edinburgh. It arrived two days before his execution; but so determined were the council on his death, that the Earl of Perth kept it up till after his execution. Nay, on the morning of that day on which he suffered, his wife applied to the Countess of Perth, be-

seeching her to interpose for his preservation, that she might not be left a widow and her five helpless children orphans, depending on the bounty of others. But even this heart-rending appeal was met by insults as unnatural as they were base, and showed that the same inhumanity possessed the breast of the countess that had been evinced by her husband. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 417.)

The sentence of the court was accordingly executed on Mr. Hume, who ascended the scaffold with the greatest tranquillity of mind, and died in the assured hope of "being ever with the Lord." His last words showed not only the peace which he felt in the conviction that he died "not as a fool dieth," but gave decided evidence of the injustice of his persecutors. "I am come here to lay down my life," said he, "and I bless the Lord that I am not to lay it down as an evil-doer; and albeit I be a sinful man as others are by nature, yet through his grace I hope I am planted in Jesus Christ, in whom I have redemption and remission of sins through his blood. The world represents me as seditious and disloyal, but God is my witness, and my own conscience, of my innocence in this matter: I am loyal, and did ever judge obedience

unto lawful authority my duty, and the duty of all Christians. I was never against the king's just power and greatness, and this I commend to all that hear me this day ; but all a Christian doth must be of *faith*, for what clasheth with the command of God cannot be our duty, and I wish the Lord may help the king to do his duty to the people, and the people to do their duty to the king. I cannot but be sensible of the sharpness of my sentence ; nevertheless I bless the Lord I find it in my heart to forgive all men, even as I desire to be forgiven, and obtain mercy in that day ; and if there be any at whose door my blood may more directly lie than others, I pray the Lord to forgive them ; and now I wish it may be well with the land when I am gone." (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 418. Scots Worthies, p. 424.)

The commissions lately granted to the military, though too extensive already, were greatly enlarged in the beginning of 1683 ; in consequence of which a more systematic course of plunder, robbery, and cruelty was devised and carried on in every part of the country. The council and justiciary court set the example of lawless extortion to all inferior judicatories civil and military. Hav-

ing procured a letter from the king on the 8th of January, depriving the prisoners of the right of having a list of the witnesses to be brought against them, and ordering all witnesses to be examined upon oath privately before appearing in court, the council proceeded to prosecute, for the sake of their estates, multitudes against whom not even the shadow of a crime could be charged. The very day on which the letter was received, William Martin, younger of Dallurg, was indicted for treason. Aware that his innocence, however clearly established, was no security, he expressed his willingness that the trial should proceed, but at the same time, though guilty of no crime whatever, renouncing all his property into the hands of the king. This being what the council desired, the diet was immediately deserted. The example of Martin was followed by many other gentlemen, who found it necessary to sacrifice their whole estates in order to save themselves from being criminally indicted. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 449.)

Innumerable prosecutions for non-conformity followed, while the fines which were imposed on offenders—and all were counted offenders whose names were on the Porte-

ous rolls—were most oppressive. Hitherto, however, those women whose husbands regularly attended the church had been in a great measure overlooked. But on the 11th of January the magistrates of Edinburgh presented to the council several queries as to the responsibility of husbands for their wives, and parents for their children. To these queries the council returned the following answers:—"That wives ought to be fined in the half of their husbands' fines: that *regular* husbands, on producing their wives to the magistrates, were no further answerable: that widows were to be fined in the half of their late husbands' fines: that unmarried women were to be fined according to the condition of their deceased parents and their own condition as to their fortunes: and that parents were answerable for their children attending the church when they were seven years of age, and fit to be catechised."\* The bonds of natural affection were indeed so utterly disregarded, that on the same day these orders were issued, An-

\* Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 422. Burnet, vol. ii. pp. 1002, 1003. This last author says, "Queensberry was for every thing that would bring money into the treasury;" and that Perth seemed to set it for a maxim—"that the Presbyterians ought to be extirpated."

drew Herron of Kerrochtree, in Galloway, was brought before the council for conversing with his own son and son-in-law, who had been at Bothwell. He pleaded ignorance of the statute, and threw himself on their mercy. But though he was pardoned “both as to his life and estate,” he was fined in the sum of five thousand merks. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 135.)

Another flagrant act of injustice committed about the same period by the council, was the apprehension, trial, and condemnation of William Lawrie of Blackwood, who was prosecuted for conversing with some of the rebels, and for permitting several of his tenants who had been at Bothwell to return and reside on his estate. In vain did he plead that he was only a tutor on the estate; that he usually resided in Edinburgh, and was consequently unacquainted with those who were esteemed rebels; and that not one of these tenants had been intercommuned or convicted of rebellion. All his defences were repelled, and he was condemned to be executed as a traitor. It is true that he was subsequently pardoned in so far as his life was concerned; but the forfeiture of his estate for this fictitious crime evidently put

into the hands of the council the property of almost every man in the kingdom. "This was such a constructive treason," says Burnet, "that went upon so many unreasonable suppositions, that it showed the shamelessness of a sort of men who had been forty years declaiming against a parliamentary attainder for a constructive treason in the case of the Earl of Stafford, and did now condemn a man upon a train of so many inferences, that it was not possible to make it look even like a constructive treason." (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 910.)

But to enumerate examples of injustice and extortion would be endless. From the most dignified to the meanest of the persecutors, every thing like either law or justice was sacrificed to their avarice. To attain this unhallowed object of their pursuit, the lives of the innocent were taken away, and the dead in their graves were tried, condemned, and forfeited, that their estates might be seized by their oppressors.

Justiciary powers having been lodged in the hands of several of the military, Major White indicted John Nisbet, younger—so called to distinguish him from his namesake of Hardhill—to stand trial for the usual

crimes of “treason and rebellion.” On refusing to answer several of the ensnaring questions which were put to him, White impiously threatened to make him sit three hours in hell. Being interrogated, if he would say “God save the king,” he answered that it was not in his power either to save or to condemn him. “*Q.* Would you say, ‘God save your beast,’ if it were fallen into a hole? *A.* No; because it is a taking of his name in vain. *Q.* Was you at Bothwell at the rebellion? *A.* Seeing you count it rebellion, it is criminal—witness of it. *Q.* Is the bishop’s death murder? *A.* I am not a judge to cognosce upon it. *Q.* Own ye the king in all matters civil and ecclesiastic, and to be head of the church? *A.* I will acknowledge none to be head of the church but Christ. *Q.* Who is lawgiver? *A.* Christ.” On these and similar answers he was condemned to be executed at Kilmarnock on the 14th of April. While in prison he drew up a minute testimony against the defections of the times, and of his own firm adherence to the covenants and the principles of the reformation. When on the scaffold, he addressed the spectators in a very pathetic speech. He informed them that though this

was the first execution in Kilmarnock, it would not, in his opinion, be the last; and having exhorted them to prepare for death, judgment, and eternity, he resigned his spirit into the hands of a compassionate Redeemer. (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 242. Scots Worthies, p. 428.)

Although the extensive powers conferred on White, Claverhouse, and others, to prosecute and pronounce sentence on the Presbyterians, seemed to be quite sufficient to extirpate the “fanatics,” yet it was deemed proper to increase the number and enlarge the powers of the circuit courts. A violent proclamation was accordingly published on the 13th of April, in which his majesty ordered the council, and all judges and magistrates, to execute the law with rigour against all who should be found guilty of *fanatical disorders*, and to prosecute such as were guilty of receiving, harbouring, or conversing with rebels. Charles also gave authority to the council to grant commissions, as ample as they themselves enjoyed, to persons in every country, for the purpose of punishing, by fines, imprisonment, or death, those who were accused of disaffection ; and to impose the test upon all, whether heritors or common

people, of whom they entertained the smallest suspicion.

To facilitate the work of plunder and death which it was the business of these courts to accomplish, *secret* rolls were ordered to be kept by the clerks, in which the names of all who should be informed against were to be inserted. The clergy too received the following instructions, which, though exceedingly gratifying to the curates, the reader is left to judge whether they were consistent with the office of the ministry : “They are to give in, upon oath, a list of their sessioners, &c., of withdrawers from the church, and non-communicants—an account of all disorders and rebellions and who were guilty—and a complete roll of all within the parish, and particular list of all the heritors: that all women who were delinquents, be given up as well as men: that they give an account of all persons who have gone out of their parishes, and the reasons of it—of fugitives, their wives or widows—and all resetters of them; and of chapmen and travellers: and that they declare who are the people in their parishes who can give the best account of all these particulars, that such may be

brought in and examined." (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 482.) The dreadful cruelties committed by the judges, officers, and underlings connected with these courts, spread terror throughout the country; their lawless proceedings rendered every place in which such courts were "erected little else than a desolation; nay, the judges and other functionaries, having already perjured themselves, seemed determined—like the Pharisees—to make every other person "two-fold more a child of hell than themselves." That this is no rash or unfounded accusation, will appear too evident from the following instance—which is one of many equally atrocious—of the procedure of these persecutors. The Laird of Westeraw having ordered intimation to be made in the church of Moffat, summoning all the heads of families to appear on the day following to take the test, exultingly, or rather fiendishly exclaimed, with a horrid oath, "that before to-morrow night they should all be damned as well as he!!" (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 495.)

In the mean time the council and judiciary court continued to sacrifice one victim after another to despotic cruelty. On the

4th of May, David Macmillan and John Wilson, who had been previously examined before the council, were placed at the bar of the justiciary court, their examinations produced against them, and, on their own confessions, found guilty of refusing to pronounce the rising at Bothwell *rebellion*, and of acknowledging the king's authority only in so far as he had kept his engagements, and acted agreeably to the word of God. They were accordingly condemned to be executed on the 16th of May. The former of these martyrs, when on the scaffold, "blessed God who had inclined him to join with the persecuted party at Bothwell; entreated all who heard him to mourn over broken vows and promises, slighted offers and opportunities, and a broken covenant; declared that he died in the firm belief that God would return to Scotland; and left his testimony against hearing of the curates, paying of cess, and the indulgence." (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 145.) "I am really of opinion," said John Wilson, "that God shall root this race of kings, root and branch away, and make them like Zeba and Zalmunna, for taking God's house in posses-

sion, and resolving to root out the seed of the godly under the name of *fanatics.*" (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 258.)

The discovery at this time in England of what was called "the Rye-house plot," exceedingly aggravated the persecution against the Presbyterians in Scotland. Whatever either of truth or of falsehood might be in the alleged conspiracy to assassinate the king and the Duke of York, it is clear that neither the Scottish nor the English patriots had any hand in it whatever.\* Exasperated at the tyranny of Charles, and anticipating still more dreadful oppressions under the reign of his popish brother, Monmouth, Sydney, Russell, and one or two other English noblemen frequently consulted with each other what measures ought to be adopted to effect the deliverance of the nation. They naturally turned their eyes to Scotland, and accordingly entered into a correspondence with several of the most emi-

\* This plot—which appears never to have been properly formed—was the device of one or two English republicans, and had no connexion with the consultations which were entered into between several of the friends of religion and liberty in both kingdoms, to devise measures for preventing the succession of the Duke of York. See Hume, vol. viii. p. 186, et seq. Burnet, vol. ii. p. 940.

nent Presbyterians in that kingdom. But after several conferences—in which an invasion by Argyle was proposed—the Scottish adherents, perceiving the ruinous nature of the undertaking, declined having any further hand in it, and the measure at that time was abandoned. These conferences having, however, come to the ears of government, Russell and Sydney were seized and executed, (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 960, et seq.) the Scottish gentlemen who were in England were arrested and sent to Scotland for trial; and proclamations were issued for the apprehension of others who were suspected of being connected with the conspiracy. A public thanksgiving was at the same time ordered to be observed “for his majesty’s deliverance from the fanatical conspiracy,” with a threat appended, against all who disobeyed this mandate, of being punished as “contemners of the royal authority.” About the same time, Alexander Gordon of Earlstoun, who had joined the united societies of the Covenanters, and was commissioned by them to represent their deplorable condition to the Protestant churches on the continent, was arrested at Tynemouth when about to

embark for Holland, on suspicion of being connected with the conspirators, and thrown into prison. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 66.)

The fatal effects of these proclamations and seizures will be afterwards seen, when we come to take a view of the proceedings of the council during the year 1684. In the mean time, we shall notice a few additional instances of the cruelty and oppression of the persecutors on those against whom no crime, except that of adhering to Presbyterian principles, could be charged.

In the beginning of June, a party of the military having seized a countryman of the name of Alexander Smith, a few miles from Glasgow, were proceeding with him to Edinburgh, when they were opposed at Inchbelly-bridge by a number of his friends in arms. A skirmish ensued, in which several on both sides were wounded, and one of the soldiers was slain. The country people proved victors, and having rescued the prisoner, they marched off in a body in the greatest order. Enraged at this defeat, the soldiers, shortly afterwards, proceeded to search the neighbourhood, and having surprised John Wharry and James Smith, who were both unarmed, and utterly ignorant of

the rencontre, they immediately apprehended them and dragged them to Glasgow. When brought before the circuit court, they in vain pleaded their innocence ; it was enough that they were seized near the place where the soldier was killed ; they were accordingly condemned to have their right hands cut off, and to be executed at Glasgow, and their bodies to be hung in chains at Inchbelly-bridge. These martyrs, who were put to death on the 13th of June, left no other testimony than what is contained in two letters addressed by them to their parents, in which they eminently display their unshaken faith, their holy joy, and their Christian resignation to the will of their Redeemer. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 237. *Scots Worthies*, pp. 452—455.)

Other five individuals were condemned to death at that time by the Glasgow circuit court, and the time of their execution referred to the council, by whom it would appear they were reprieved. But it is impossible to give any further detail at present of the proceedings either of that circuit or of the others which were held in almost every county. Each of them was cruelly oppressive ; multitudes being driven by them from their

homes, and forced to become wanderers in a country, the laws of which made it death for any individual either to converse with or supply them with food, and yet from which they were not permitted to make their escape.

Notwithstanding the vigilance of the council and their numerous agents, it is somewhat remarkable that none of the assassins of Sharpe—except Hackston of Rathillet, who was executed for the part he had acted at Airsmoss—had fallen into their hands. They were at length gratified, however, by the seizure of Andrew Guillan, who was apprehended on the 12th of June, simply for non-conformity, and afterwards artfully ensnared into something like a confession that he was present at the primate's death.\* At one of his examinations, M'Kenzie, in expatiating on the aggravating circumstances which attended the murder of the bishop, having said that “when Sharpe was upon his knees praying, they killed him,” Guillan exclaimed, “O dreadful! he would not pray one word for all that could be said to him.”

\* Guillan was by trade a weaver, and, living in the neighbourhood of Magus moor, was called out on that occasion to hold the horses of those by whom the deed was perpetrated.

This was enough. He was immediately indicted; his confession produced as sufficient evidence against him, and the following sentence pronounced : “That he be taken to the cross of Edinburgh on the 20th of July, have both his hands cut off at the foot of the gallows, and then be hanged ; his head to be cut off and fixed at Cupar, and his body to be hung in chains at Magus moor.” (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 463.) He endured his sufferings with great fortitude, vindicating the part he had acted, and declaring that “it was no more than justice that was executed on that Judas, who sold the kirk of Scotland for fifty thousand merks a-year.” (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 233.)

That the vengeance of the council should have fallen in its utmost severity on Guillan, was what might have been expected. But what excuse can be brought forward for the numerous “legal murders” which were committed on those against whom the shadow of a crime could not be proven ? For example, Robert Hamilton, of Monkland, a regular hearer of the curates, was indicted before the justiciary court on the 24th of July, charged with “keeping a council of war with the bishop’s murderers, conversing with

them, and receiving rent from tenants after they had been at Bothwell." Hamilton clearly proved, that when the west country army was encamped in the vicinity of his house, one of his children had wandered, and supposing him to be in the crowd, he went thither, and having found him, immediately returned home; and in respect to converse, all he had spoken to any of the Covenanters was, his giving an advice to his brother-in-law to leave the rebels. But M'Kenzie had the audacity to declare, that it was not the intention with which he went to the rebels' camp, but the fact of his being there, that he had to do with, and on that ground alone Hamilton was condemned to be executed on the 10th of August! On his taking the test, however, the sentence of death was changed for an exorbitant fine; and in a short time afterwards he died, in consequence of the cruel treatment which he had received. (Wodrow, vol. iii. p. 464.)

Having, in the course of three days, imprisoned upwards of one hundred individuals for non-conformity—several of whom were liberated on taking the test—the council continued to imbrue their hands in the blood of the innocent. John Dick, a student of medi-

cine, was examined on the 29th of August, and having boldly avowed his principles—maintaining the lawfulness of the rising at Bothwell, and expressing his abhorrence of the test—he was indicted on the 4th of September, found guilty, and condemned to be executed on the 28th. The examination of George Lapsley, miller in Linlithgow, which took place about the same time, is too interesting to be passed over with such brevity. He was called before them while employed in reading the Bible, which he carried with him under his arm, and was examined as follows: “*Q.* Wherefore are you in prison? *A.* For hearing the gospel. *Q.* Do you go to church? *A.* No. *Q.* Wherefore? *A.* Because they are not the sent ministers of Christ, and because of their perjury. *Q.* Will you own the king’s authority? *A.* According to the word of God and covenants, and no otherwise, which you have broken and burnt, and for which the Lord will be avenged. *Q.* Was the bishop’s death murder? *A.* I am not concerned with his life or death either. *Q.* Was Hackston’s death a murder? *A.* Yes, and all those whose lives you have taken these two-and-twenty years. *Q.* What book is that under your

arm? *A.* It is the acts of the parliament of heaven, and I charge you, as ye shall answer at the great day, when ye and I shall stand on equal terms, that ye judge according to what is contained in it. *Q.* Is it lawful to resist the king's forces at the field meetings? *A.* Yes, the law of nature allows self-defence, and the word of God and our covenants to stand to the defence of one another." Previous to being indicted, however, this undaunted Covenanter, together with Mr. Dick, already condemned, and twenty-four other individuals, escaped out of prison, by means of cutting the iron bars of a window; and it is not a little remarkable, that not one of them was retaken except Mr. Dick, who was apprehended next year. (*Scots Worthies*, p. 464.)

During the time of these persecutions, Mr. James Renwick, who was ordained at Groningen, in the United Provinces, returned to Scotland, and was not only heartily welcomed by the poor wanderers, but immediately chosen to be their minister. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 104.) However desperate the undertaking, he resolved to follow the example of Cameron and Cargill, and preach either in the fields or in houses as he should

have opportunity. At the first field meeting, which was held in a moss at Darmead, in the month of November, he distinctly explained his principles, showing why he could not conscientiously join either with the curates, or the indulged. (*Life of Renwick*, p. 63.) His public condemnation of the indulgence, together with all the other defections of the times, was, on the one hand, highly resented by the indulged ministers ; and, on the other, it furnished the council with a new pretext for increasing the persecution, and, as we shall afterwards see, rendering the country little else than “ a field of blood.”



## CHAPTER VI.

Court of justiciary proceedings—trial of Sir Hugh Campbell of Cesnock—the evidence against him confounded—he is acquitted—executions at Glasgow—death of Captain Paton—Spence and Carstairs tortured—trial of Baillie of Jerviswood—his striking appeal to M'Kenzie—he is found guilty and executed—rescue of a minister and several Covenanters at Entreken Pass—increased persecution—examples—case of Porterfield of Duchal—executions in Edinburgh—dreadful sufferings of the Covenanters—Mr. Renwick condemned in absence for holding conventicles—Apologetical Declaration—its effects—proceedings against those who refused to disown it—the indulgence recalled—oath of abjuration.

EACH succeeding year of this dismal period of Scottish history exhibits a picture still

darker and more revolting than that of its predecessor. So many atrocities were committed in 1684, and in the years following, that it is but a few here and there of which we can give any account. But these alone brought forward will much more than confirm the emphatic designation of “killing time” being too justly applied to the period which intervened between 1684 and the Revolution.

We shall commence with giving some account of several trials which took place before the court of justiciary. On the 18th of Feoruary, George Martin, John Ker, and James Muir were indicted before that court, for “treason,” or rather for refusing to abandon the Presbyterian faith. Their confessions, as usual, were the only evidence adduced against them, and sentence of death followed. They were executed on the 22d, and died expressing their joy that “they were counted worthy to suffer for the name of Christ.” (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 57.) These martyrs were followed to the scaffold by Mr. John Dick, who escaped out of prison in the preceding September, but was retaken in the beginni: g of March, and ordered to be executed on the 5th of that month. Having ad-

dressed the spectators in language most affecting, he mounted the ladder with firmness and holy joy, and, looking around him, said, "I remember a passage of Abraham, who was commanded to sacrifice his son Isaac; he having, in obedience to the command, brought his son to offer him up a sacrifice, reared up an altar, and Isaac said to him, 'Here is the altar, and there is the wood, but where is the sacrifice?' (and then pointing to the gibbet and the ladder, he said,) here is the altar and the wood, and (laying his hand on his breast) blessed be God here is a free-will offering, and I will give it willingly and cheerfully; yea, I can say it here, even upon the brink of eternity, that these several years I have preferred the glory of God, the welfare and prosperity of the work and interest of Christ and his people, to my own private and particular interest; and I might have shunned such a death as this, but, God knows, I durst not do it." (Scots Worthies, p. 481.)

The trial of Sir Hugh Campbell of Cessnock, who was apprehended on suspicion of being accessory to the Rye-house plot, deserves particular notice, showing, as it does, the iniquity, barbarity, and profaneness of the existing administration. Determined on

his death, and yet having no evidence to convict him of being connected with the plot, M'Kenzie found it necessary to indict him on a charge of being guilty of rebellion at Bothwell. He was accordingly indicted before the court on the 24th of March, on the following charge : " That Sir Hugh having, in June, 1679, met with Daniel Crawford in Galston, Thomas Ingram in Borelands, John Ferguson in Catharingill, and several other of the rebels, at or near the bridge-end of Galston, asked them where they had been, and, when they told him they had been with the westland army, he said that he had seen more going to them than coming from them ; and having asked them if they were to return, they told him they knew not. Whereupon he treasonably said, that he liked not runaways, and they should get help if they would bide by it ; and bade them take courage, or some such words to that purpose. The debates on the relevancy were exceedingly tedious. Cesnock offered to prove, that on the day these persons passed the bridge of Galston he was at his own house. The court, however, found the charge relevant, and the trial proceeded. In vain

did Cesnock's council produce evidence that the witnesses against their client were suborned, and guilty of deadly malice ; M'Kenzie argued against every objection, and his quibbles were adopted as sound doctrine by the court. Two witnesses for the crown were then brought forward, namely, Ingram and Crawford ; but when the former held up his hand to swear, Cesnock, fixing his eyes upon him, addressed him in the words following : "Take heed now what you are about to do, and damn not your own soul by perjury ; for as I shall answer to God, and upon the peril of my own soul, I am here ready to declare, I never saw you in the face before this process, nor spake to you." Confounded at this unexpected appeal, Ingram retracted what he had said against Cesnock in his precognition, declaring that he never heard him utter the words charged against him in the indictment. The spectators immediately expressed their satisfaction by a shout, which so enraged M'Kenzie, that he declared, "he believed Cesnock had hired his friends to make this acclamation, in order to confound the king's evidence, and he never heard of such a Protestant roar, except in the

trial of Shaftesbury; that he had always a kindness for that persuasion\* till now, that he was convinced in his conscience, it hugs the most damnable trinket in nature." (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 91.) When silence was restored, the justice-general again interrogated Ingram; but he refused to give any other evidence. Attempting to repeat the question a third time, Nisbet of Craigentinny, one of the jury, rose and said, that though Ingram should be examined twenty times, they would receive his first deposition only. "Sir," said the justice-general, "you are not judges in this case." "Yes, my lord," replied the Laird of Drum, another juryman, "we are the only competent judges as to the probation, though not of its relevancy." Crawford, the other witness, swore that he had not seen Cesnock for a considerable time, either before or after Bothwell. The jury, of course, returned a verdict of not guilty; yet Cesnock was remanded to prison, his estate forfeited, and shortly afterwards he was sent to the Bass. The jury were forced to make an apology for creating a riot in

\* Truly the Presbyterians were little indebted to the *kindness* of so determined an enemy to every thing that savoured of genuine godliness.

court, and the witnesses were laid in irons. (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 1000. Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 92. Fountainhall's Decisions, vol. i. p. 287.)

While the council and justiciary court were thus employed, the five following individuals, viz. John Richmond, James Winning, Archibald Stewart, James Johnston, and John Main, were tried before the military commission court at Glasgow. They were charged with being either themselves at Bothwell, or holding converse with the rebels who were in that engagement; and though the depositions of the witnesses were not only insufficient to criminate them, but in many points contradictory, the prisoners were found guilty, and condemned to be executed at Glasgow on the 19th of March. As a specimen of the injustice of this trial and sentence, we shall notice the case of John Richmond only. In conformity with the lawless mode of procedure then adopted, he was seized by the military while quietly walking along the streets of Glasgow, and upon his endeavouring to escape, he was pursued, overtaken, and most cruelly treated, though, as yet, they even knew not who he was. He was immediately carried to

the guard-house, his hands and feet were bound together, and he was left for some hours lying upon the ground, bleeding of his wounds. When before the court, he was accused of being at Airsmoss, but in proof of this only one witness alleged that he saw him there, and when cross-questioned, that witness acknowledged he was half a mile distant. Yet this was held sufficient evidence to take away a man's life ! The whole of these martyrs "finished their course with joy," and, like Stephen, the protomartyr, spent their last moments in praying for their murderers. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 265. *Scots Worthies*, p. 482.)

Among the numerous "rebels" whose names appeared on the fugitive roll—which was shortly afterwards printed, containing a list of eighteen hundred and sixty-three names—none was more obnoxious to the council than Captain John Paton of Meadow-head, as having held a command both at Pentland and Bothwell. To their unspeakable gratification this "notorious rebel" was at length apprehended, and after a preliminary examination, indicted for treason on the 16th of April. His confession before the council was deemed sufficient evidence

against him, and he was sentenced to be executed on the 23d. He was, however, respited till the 9th of May, when he suffered death with a fortitude, cheerfulness, and Christian exultation that astonished his very persecutors. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 65.)

It is impossible, however, to enumerate all the “legal murders” committed by a blood-thirsty administration on an unoffending people. Death alone seemed too trifling a punishment, and torture, the most exquisite and revolting, was therefore added ; one instance of which we have in the case of Arthur Tacket, who, for refusing to divulge the name of the preacher at a conventicle, was most inhumanly tortured, and then executed.

If the simple attendance at conventicles was attended with such fatal effects, we may conceive something of the cruelty of government against those who were accused of being accessory to the Rye-house plot. A letter from Argyle, written in cipher, having been intercepted, Mr. William Spence, his lordship’s secretary, was put to the torture, in order to extort from him a disclosure of the secrets which it contained. Nothing, however, having been elicited, the council, with a barbarity to which the Spanish inquisition

alone furnishes a parallel, ordered Spence to be kept from sleep night and day, by regular watches. And when even this failed, he was again subjected to the torture by means of the *thumbiekins*. At length, wearied out by suffering, Spence acknowledged that various consultations had been held for the purpose of preventing the succession of the Duke of York, and securing the preservation of the Protestant religion, but that nothing had been said regarding assassination—all which he proved by deciphering Argyle's letter. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 97. Burnet, vol. ii. p. 1005.) Enough however was divulged to implicate Mr. William Carstairs and Baillie of Jerviswood, who were immediately subjected to inquisitorial examination

Carstairs was tortured for an hour and a half; but nothing further could be extorted from him “than what amounted to loose discourse as to what might be proper to be done for securing religion and liberty from the dangers they were in, without any design against the royal persons of the king or his brother.” (Burnet, vol. ii. p. 1006.) Baillie, of Jerviswood, again, who had been for some time in prison, was particularly obnoxious to the council. Though within a few weeks of his

dissolution, his trial was hurried on, and, as usual, M'Kenzie uttered a virulent harangue against the prisoner, clearly evincing the determination of the council to accomplish his destruction. Notwithstanding his indisposition, Jerviswood addressed the jury in the following affecting language :—“ There is one thing which vexes me extremely, and wherein I am injured to the utmost degree, and that is for a plot to cut off the king and his royal highness. I am in all probability to appear, in some hours, before the tribunal of the Great Judge, and in presence of your lordships and all here, I solemnly declare, that never was I prompted or privy to any such thing, and that I abhor and detest all thoughts or principles for touching the life and blood of his sacred majesty or his royal brother.” Then turning to M'Kenzie, “ My lord,” said he, “ I think it very strange you charge me with such abominable things ; you may remember that when you came to me in prison, you told me such things were laid to my charge, but that you did not believe them. How then, my lord, come you to lay such a stain upon me with so much violence ? Are you now convinced in your conscience, that I am more guilty than be-

fore? You may remember what passed between us in prison." All eyes were now turned on M'Kenzie, who blushed, as well he might, while he attempted to vindicate himself by the following base declaration: "Jerviswood," said he, "I own what you say; my thoughts there were as a private man; but what I say here is by special direction of the privy council;" and pointing to Paterson the clerk, added, "he knows my orders." "If your lordship have one conscience for yourself," replied Jerviswood, "and another for the council, I pray God forgive you; I do;" and turning to the justice-general, he added, "My lord, I trouble your lordships no further." Notwithstanding this open avowal of the injustice of Jerviswood's trial, the good man was declared guilty, and condemned to be executed, his head to be fixed on the Netherbow port of Edinburgh, and his body quartered and distributed in different parts of the kingdom; which unjust sentence was executed in every particular, to the everlasting infamy of his murderers, and his own unspeakable and eternal gain. (Fountainhall, vol. i. p. 327. Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 112. Burnet, vol. ii. p. 1010.)

But leaving for a little these dismal transactions, we shall give an account of a bold and successful effort of a small party of Covenanters to rescue their brethren from the fangs of their inhuman tormentors. In the end of July, a numerous field meeting was held in Nithsdale, not far from Drumlanrig castle, at which about sixty of the hearers appeared in arms. They had scarcely assembled when an alarm was given that they were betrayed, and that two parties of dragoons were marching to attack them ; upon which the people immediately separated. When the military came forward, they found the congregation dispersed ; but were opposed by three hundred Covenanters who had chosen their ground, and were resolved to stand on their defence. Not daring to encounter that determined band, the dragoons pursued the stragglers, and having seized six or eight unarmed men with the minister, they bound them, and proceeded with them on the road to Edinburgh. Their route lay through a steep and narrow pass on Entrekin hill, by which the military heedlessly conducted their prisoners. "This Entrekin," says the author of *Memoirs of the Church of Scotland*, "is a very steep and dangerous mountain ;

and had not the dragoons been infatuated from heaven, they would never have entered such a pass, without well discovering the hill above them. The road for above a mile goes winding, with a moderate ascent, on the side of a very high and steep hill, till on the latter part, still ascending, and the height on the left above them being still vastly great, the depth on their right below them makes a prodigious precipice, descending steep and ghastly into a narrow deep bottom, only broad enough for the current of water to run that descends upon hasty rain. The passage on the side of the first hill is narrow ; so that two horsemen can but ill pass in front, and if any disorder should happen to them, they are in danger of falling down the said precipice on their right, where there would be no stopping till they came to the bottom.”

Through this pass the dragoons were slowly proceeding, when they were suddenly arrested by a voice calling to them from the hill above. It was misty, and nobody was at first seen ; but the commanding officer halted, and inquired who called, and what was wanted. He had no sooner spoken, than twelve of the countrymen made their

appearance. The officer reiterated his inquiry, and commanded them to stand. But one of the countrymen, who seemed to be their leader, having ordered his men to "make ready," asked the officer, "Sir, will ye deliver our minister?" "No, sir," was the reply, "an ye were to be damned." At which the leader of the countrymen fired, and shot him through the head, when both the rider and his horse fell over the precipice and were dashed in pieces. The rest of the twelve were preparing to fire, when the officer next in command requested a truce. The whole party were indeed in a situation so dreadful, that not one of them durst stir a foot, or offer to fire a shot; and had the countrymen given a volley, they would all have been driven headlong down the side of the mountain into the dreadful gulf below. To add to their consternation, some travellers, who appeared at the head of the pass, and seeing the military, stepped aside to allow the soldiers to march forward, were supposed to be another party of armed countrymen.

Having no choice, therefore, the officer again asked what were their demands. "Deliver our minister," was the reply. "Well,"

rejoined the officer, “ ye’s get your minister, an ye will promise to forbear firing.” “ Indeed we’ll forbear,” said the countrymen, “ we desire to hurt none of you ; but ye must deliver all the prisoners.” Compelled to accede to these demands, the officer ordered the prisoners to be unloosed, and suffered to depart. He first, however, addressed the minister, saying, “ Sir, I let you go, and I expect you promise to oblige your people to offer no hinderance to our march.” The minister having promised to do so, “ Then go, sir,” added the officer, “ you owe your life to this damned mountain.” “ Rather, sir,” rejoined the minister, “ to that God that made this mountain.”

Having obtained the prisoners, the countrymen were marching away in triumph, when the officer again called to their leader, and pointing to the travellers at the head of the pass, said, “ I expect you ’ll be as good as your word ; and call off those fellows you have posted at the head of the way.” “ They belong not to us,” was the reply, “ they are unarmed people waiting till you pass by.” “ Say you so ?” rejoined the officer, “ had I known that, you had not gotten your men so cheap, or come off so free.” “ And are

ye for battle, sir," said the countrymen, "we are ready for you still ; if you think you are able for us, ye may try your hands ; we 'll quit the truce if ye like." "No," replied the officer, "I think ye be brave fellows, e'en gang your gate."\*

This rescue roused the indignation of the council to the highest pitch. Proclamations were issued, and military crusades ordered to be made throughout the district to apprehend the parties concerned. The cruelties which followed are almost incredible, if indeed any thing, however barbarous and illegal, can be imagined too revolting for so disgraceful an administration either to have planned or carried into effect. Confiscation, imprisonment, banishment, torture, or death, was the lot of all who but hesitated to renounce their religion, and perjure their own souls at the command of the meanest and most worthless sentinel. The circuit courts made dreadful havoc

\* Mem. of the Church of Scotland, pp. 193, 194.—The same author adds, "The officer of dragoons was threatened with a council of war for this affair; and whether he was not broke for cowardice, I am not certain; but this I am certain of, that had the best of them been upon the spot, they must have done the same, or have resolved to have made a journey headlong down such a hill as would have chilled the blood of a man of good courage but to have thought of."—Wodrow gives a somewhat different account of this rescue.

among those whom the military first plundered and then dragged to their bar ; and to prevent any escaping from the kingdom, no vessel was allowed to sail without being searched. Desolation and misery were, in short, spread throughout the land. For not only were the emissaries of a government, “drunken with the blood of the saints,” hired to plunder, oppress, and murder without discrimination, but, to use the words of inspiration, the fearful command was both issued and enforced, for “brother to deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child, and the children to rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death.”

We are at no loss to adduce proofs of these dreadful charges. Alas ! they are so many. One or two instances, however, will fully corroborate all that we have stated. In regard to fines, something of their enormous amount may be conceived from the fact, that in the county of Roxburgh alone, the sum imposed on a few of the chief heritors for the absence of their ladies from church was £22,500 sterling ; while from six of the gentlemen in Renfrewshire were extorted upwards of £19,000. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 225.) But the case of John Porterfield of Duchal is perhaps as

glaring an instance of disgraceful tyranny as we can select. His chief crime consisted in not having *revealed* an application made to him by Sir John Cochrane, for fifty pounds, to the Earl of Argyle, though he had decidedly refused to give one shilling to the applicant. To accomplish their iniquitous project, M<sup>c</sup>Kenzie submitted to the lords of session a query, of the following tenor, regarding this new species of crime: “It being treason by the common law and ours, to supply and comfort declared traitors, and it being treason by our law to conceal treason: **Quaeritur**, Whether Sir John Cochrane, having asked of Porterfield of Duchal, who was not related to the late Earl of Argyle, the sum of fifty pounds sterling for the said earl’s use, being a declared and notorious traitor, and Duchal not having revealed the same to his majesty, or his officers, whereby the prejudice that might have followed thereupon might have been prevented, is not the foresaid concealing, and not revealing, treason?” To which their lordships gravely returned the following answer, “That in their judgment the concealing and not revealing in the case foresaid, is treason!” Duchal was consequently indicted, condemned, and his

estate forfeited. Nay, before sentence was pronounced, Lord Melford, the very judge that condemned him, had the gift of his estate. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 138.)

The immense numbers imprisoned for non-conformity rendered it necessary to devise measures for disposing of the offenders. As many as possible were condemned to death: but, after forfeiture, transportation was the most effectual and summary method of getting rid of the obnoxious Presbyterians. One ship load after another was accordingly despatched to America, where the unhappy victims were sold for slaves, and any little money given them by their friends was violently taken from them by their persecutors. John Gate, for example, thatcher in Glasgow, while at work on a house where some of the military were drinking, was ordered to come down and drink the king's health. Aware of his danger, he waved the toast, for which he was carried along with the party, thrown into prison, and shortly afterwards transported to Carolina, leaving a wife and eight helpless children in a state of the utmost destitution. Yet though multitudes were torn from their families and doomed to perish in a foreign land, voluntary banishment was pro-

hibited. Several gentlemen of Clydesdale having petitioned the council to allow them to transport themselves to America, were denied their request. "His majesty," said the infamous Queensberry, "may get £10,000 sterling from them, and he may then dispose of them as he thinks proper."\*

Although the test was originally framed for those only who held places of trust, it was soon imposed on every individual throughout the kingdom, and all who scrupled to take it were treated as enemies to government. Claverhouse and Lagg were the most violent in enforcing that unhallowed oath, and torture or death was the penalty inflicted for non-compliance with it. Robert Ferguson, James M'Michan, Robert Stewart, and John Grieve, for simply refusing to take the test, were shot by Claverhouse in Galloway, and their bodies for some time prevented from being interred. The example of the superior officers was implicitly followed by their subalterns, who with impunity put prisoners to death without even the form of a trial. (Life

\* Fountainhall, vol. i. p. 319.—This avaricious tyrant, like his companions in iniquity, was far more concerned for his own aggrandizement from fines imposed on the Presbyterians, than for the increase of the revenue to government.

of Renwick, p. 91.) For no crime whatever, William Shirinlaw, a youth of eighteen years of age, being apprehended while walking peaceably along the highway, was ordered to be shot by Lauder, a petty officer in the garrison of Sorn. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 177.)

While searching the country for the party concerned in the rescue at Entrekin, Claverhouse apprehended Thomas Harkness, Andrew Clark, and Samuel M·Ewen, three individuals who had no concern in that affair. Like many of their persecuted brethren they were under hiding, and were seized by the bloodhounds when fast asleep in the fields. When taken, though wounded by the shot of the soldiers, they were not permitted to have their wounds dressed. In this state they were conveyed first to Lanark and then to Edinburgh, where they arrived on the 15th of August. On being brought before the council, they firmly denied having been at the rescue of the prisoners; but upon three of the soldiers deponing that they had seen them there, and that the wounds they had upon them had been then received—a statement obviously false—they were forthwith remitted to the justiciary court, condemned, and executed on the very day on which they

arrived in Edinburgh. (*Scots Worthies*, p. 514.)

Among the spectators at the execution of these three martyrs, was an eminent Christian of the name of James Nichol, who, in the bitterness of his spirit, having said in the hearing of those around him, “These kine of Bashan have pushed these three good men to death at one push, contrary to their own base laws, in a most inhuman manner,” was immediately seized and carried to prison. Being brought before the council and examined, he was remitted to the justiciary court. His own confession was the only proof against him; yet on that confession he was condemned, and executed on the 27th of that month, along with William Young, another unoffending Presbyterian. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 302. *Scots Worthies*, p. 516.)

One example more of the cruelty of these persecutors towards even children will be sufficient at present. It is from the pen of one of the Covenanters themselves; and, though it took place several months before the period of which we are treating, is too affecting to be omitted. “It was designed by my friends,” says the writer, at that time in his thirteenth year, “that I should go and

stay with a kinsman of my father's; but, upon second thoughts, without any foreseen reason, it was judged more proper to send my younger brother, which was a kind providence to me; for shortly after he went, there was a party of the enemy came to that man's house, to search for some of the persecuted party. When the people of the house saw the enemy coming they fled out of the way; but the cruel enemy got my dear brother into their hands. They examined him concerning the persecuted people, where they haunted, or if he knew where any of them were; but he would not open his mouth to speak one word to them. They flattered him; they offered him money to tell where the whigs were; but he would not speak. They held the point of a drawn sword to his naked breast; they fired a pistol over his head; they set him on horseback behind one of themselves, to be taken away and hanged; they tied a cloth on his face, and set him on his knees to be shot to death; they beat him with their swords and with their fists; they kicked him several times to the ground with their feet: yet after they had used all the cruelty they could, he would not open his mouth to speak one word to them; and

although he was a very comely child, going in ten years of age, yet they called him a vile ugly dumb devil, and beat him very sore, and then went their way, leaving him lying on the ground, sore bleeding, in the open fields. (*Memoirs of James Nisbet*, pp. 69, 70.)

Notwithstanding the terror of such atrocities, conventicles were held by Mr. James Renwick in various parts of the country. The most sequestered spots were sought out, and resorted to by many, whose only consolation on earth now was, to enjoy, though at the risk of their lives, divine ordinances in purity. (*Hind Let Loose*, p. 159.) These meetings were extremely galling to the council, who determined not only to suppress them, but to accomplish the destruction of all their supporters. Mr. Renwick—who was designated a vagrant preacher—having been cited to appear before them, was intercommuned, and rewards were offered for his apprehension. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 149.) Proceeding a step further, the council, on the 19th of September indicted him, in absence, before the court, “for being at Bothwell-bridge, and preaching at field conventicles, at Blackloch, Welshole, Craig, Spittalhole,

Greenock, and other places, and teaching, “that the king was no king but a tyrant.” Being cited, and not appearing, “they discern him outlaw and fugitive, and order him to be put to the horn.”\* Mr. Renwick, however, was neither deterred from preaching the gospel to his persecuted countrymen by the threats of the council, nor appalled at the anticipation of the sufferings which lay before him. (*Life of Renwick*, p. 81.) “None of these things moved him, neither did he count his life dear unto himself, so that he might finish his course with joy, and the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.”

The people who adhered to this persecuted minister were equally determined, cost what it would, not to abandon their principles. Their condition was indeed truly pitiable. Hunted like wild beasts from mountain to mountain, they were forced to seek refuge in caves, in woods, or in mosses, whither they were pursued, sought out, and

\* It was not the tyranny of either king or judges that Mr. Renwick particularly insisted on in his sermons. His great aim was to preach the gospel of Christ, the doctrines of which were unknown to, or disregarded by, the prelates and their underlings.—See Renwick’s Sermons.

such as fell into the hands of their enemies put to death upon the spot.\* To converse with them, or supply them with any of the common necessaries of life, or even to forbear giving intimation of their places of concealment was declared treason. Spies and informers were hired and encouraged, and rewarded with the spoils of the persecuted; and to complete the work of cruelty a new cess was levied to maintain a standing army for accomplishing the destruction of the covenanters.

The patience and Christian resignation with which all these miseries were endured by the persecuted, can be accounted for only on the ground that their principles were vastly different from those which their enemies in the present day so unjustly lay to their charge. Human nature, however, could hardly be expected to submit to such dreadful oppression without using some efforts to obtain relief. The covenanters were cast out

\* It is stated by Wodrow, that "wonderful were the preservations of the persecuted about this time. The soldiers frequently got their clothes and cloaks, and yet missed themselves. They would have gone by the mouths of the caves and dens in which they were lurking, and the dogs would snook and smell about the stones under which they were hid and yet they remained undiscovered."—Hist., vol. iv. p. 171.

of the protection of law ; they were denied an asylum in a foreign land ; and they were uncertain but that every moment might be their last. In circumstances like these, we cannot wonder at their taking a step which though liable to some degree of censure, seemed almost imperative, and one which, it will be kept in mind, was taken with the greatest reluctance. This was the publication of a paper entitled “The Apologetic Declaration and Admonitory Vindication agen<sup>t</sup> Intelligencers and Informers,” which was drawn up and affixed on many of the market crosses and church doors in the month of October. After mentioning their renunciation of the authority of Charles, and their declaration of war against him and his accomplices, it runs in the following terms : — “ That therein our mind may be understood, and for preventing further mistakes agen<sup>t</sup> our purpose, we do hereby jointiy and unanimously testify and declare, that, as we utterly detest and abhor that hellish principle of killing all who differ in judgment or persuasion from us, it having no bottom upon the word of God or right reason ; so we look upon it as a duty binding upon us to publish openly unto the world,

that for as much as we are firmly and really purposed not to injure or offend any whomsoever, yet we do hereby declare unto all, that whosoever shall stretch forth their hands against us, while we are maintaining the cause and interest of Christ against his enemies, in defence of his covenanted religion, by shedding our blood actually, either by authoritative commanding, such as bloody councillors, especially that so called justiciary, generals of forces, adjutants, captains, &c., who make it their work to imbrue their hands in our blood; or by obeying such commands, such as bloody militia men, malicious troopers, soldiers and dragoons, &c., or who deliver up any of us into their hands to the spilling of our blood;—such as designedly and purposely advise, counsel, and encourage them to proceed against us to our utmost extirpation, by informing against us wickedly and wittingly, such as viperous and malicious bishops and curates, and all such sort of intelligencers, who lay out themselves to the effusion of our blood, together with all such as, in obedience to the enemies their commands, raise the *hue and cry* after us: We say, all and every one of such shall be reputed by us enemies to God and the

covenanted work of reformation, and punished as such according to our power and the degree of their offence, chiefly if they shall continue, after the publication of this our declaration, obstinately and habitually with malice to proceed against us any of the foresaid ways.—We are sorry at our very hearts that any of you should choose such courses, either with bloody *Doeg* to shed our blood, or with the flattering *Ziphites* to inform persecutors where we are to be found. So we say again, we desire you to take warning of the hazard that ye incur by following such courses; for the sinless necessity of self-preservation, accompanied with holy zeal for Christ's reigning in our land, and suppressing of profanity, will move us not to let you pass unpunished. Call to your remembrance, All that is in peril is not lost, and all that is delayed is not forgiven. Therefore expect to be dealt with as ye deal with us, so far as our power can reach; not because we are actuated by a sinful spirit of revenge for private and personal injuries, but mainly because by our fall, reformation suffers damage," &c. (Informatory Vindication, pp. 96—100. Life of Renwick, p. 80.)

Whatever degree of censure may be due

to some expressions in these extracts, it is impossible to read them without feelings of indignation at the persecutors, whose tyranny and cruelty had driven a sober and religious people to such extremities. That the Covenanters had no desire to take away the lives of their enemies, is evident. All that they aimed at was to impress their minds with a wholesome terror. This end was in some measure gained: informers were terrified, and the persecution was not so violent for some time after the publication of this paper. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 150.) It is indeed alleged that the Apologetic Declaration led to the commission of murder; and two instances are brought forward, namely, that of two soldiers at Swine-Abbev, and the curate of Carsphairn. But it has never yet been ascertained whether any of the Covenanters had a hand in the former; nay, says Wodrow, “I am assured the society people refused to admit some persons to their fellowships, whom they suspected to be concerned in this murder.”\* The latter, again, was publicly disowned and con-

\* Wodrow, vol. iv. p 153. The names of these soldiers were Kennoway and Stewart, a detail of whose lawless, persecuting, and cruel conduct is given by the same author, and of which we have already taken some notice.

deimned by the society people. "We do hereby disclaim," say they, "all unwarrantable practices committed by any few persons, reputed to be of us, whereby the Lord hath been offended, his cause wronged, and we all made to endure the scourge of tongues, for which things we have desired to make conscience of mourning before the Lord both in public and private."\*

But while the publication of this paper struck a salutary terror into the minds of several of the informers, it increased the fury of the council, who lost no time in devising new and still more cruel measures against these undaunted non-conformists. An act was accordingly passed on the 22d of November, which not inappropriately has received the title of "*bloody*," ordaining "every person who owns, or will not disown, the late treasonable declaration upon oath, whether he have arms or not, to be immediately put to death, in presence of two witnesses, and the person or persons having commission from the council for that effect." (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 155.) Commissions were also

\* Life of Renwick, p. 89. "The actors," adds Shields "were ever since excluded from their communion."

given to several noblemen, gentlemen, and military officers “to convocate all the inhabitants (in a number of parishes named,) men and women, above fourteen years of age; and if any own the late traitorous declaration or assassination of the soldiers, you shall execute them by military execution upon the spot: and if any be absent, ye shall burn their houses and seize their goods,” &c. These instructions were not only carried into effect to the very letter, but all the inhabitants of a parish being convened, questions were put to them concerning the king’s authority, their adherence to prelacy, &c. and the soldiers sitting on horseback around them with drawn swords, were ready to execute on them the sentence of death if they but hesitated to return satisfactory answers to these inquisitorial interrogatories.

As a corresponding accompaniment to these severities, the indulgence was recalled, and all the indulged ministers were obliged “to give bond not to exercise any part of their ministry in Scotland.” Several of them were sent to the Bass, others were banished to the plantations, and not a few were immured in prisons. From this period, in short,

till the toleration in 1687, Presbyterian ministers were prohibited from exercising their ministry in any part of the kingdom.

To complete their infamous work, the council framed an “oath of abjuration,” renouncing the Apologetic Declaration and its authors, and promising never to assist them in any point. A proclamation was at the same time issued, “prohibiting all past the age of sixteen years, to presume to travel without certificates of their loyalty and good principles, by taking the oath of abjuration; with certification, that all who shall adventure to travel without such certificate, shall be holden and used as connivers with the said rebels.” (Life of Renwick, p. 90.)

The sufferings of the Covenanters which followed, were truly appalling. But instead of harrowing up the feelings of the reader with additional instances of atrocity, we shall close this year with the following extract from a sermon by the eloquent Dr. Charters. “In the midst of the fiery furnace of persecution,” says that writer, “men appeared assuming the high character of witnesses for God, and maintaining it in the face of danger and death. Though few in number, like the gleaning of grapes after the vintage, and a

few berries on the outermost bough, they lifted up the fallen standard of religious liberty. They would swear no oaths, subscribe no bonds, take no test, nor yield to any imposition on conscience. They testified against all the arbitrary persecuting acts of Charles, and published acts of their own, disowning the king, excluding the Duke of York, and declaring war in defence of their religion and of their lives. The avowal of disaffection was the signal of death, and by means of mercenary spies and traitors, many of them were seized and executed. They denounced vengeance on the spies, admonishing both the bloody Doegs and flattering Ziphites to remember 'All that is in peril is not lost, and all that is delayed is not forgiven.' The coward race were appalled by a threatening that came from men without falsehood and without fear. Their standard on the mountains of Scotland indicated to the vigilant eye of William that the nation was ripening for a change. They expressed what others thought, uttering the indignation and the groans of a spirited and oppressed people. They investigated and taught under the guidance of feeling, the reciprocal obligations of kings and subjects, the duty of self-defence

and of resisting tyrants, the generous principle of assisting the oppressed, or in their language, *helping the Lord against the mighty*. These subjects, which have been investigated by philosophers in the closet, and adorned with eloquence in the senate, were then illustrated by men of feeling in the field. While Lord Russel, and Sidney, and other enlightened patriots in England, were plotting against Charles, from a conviction that his right was forfeited, the Cameronians in Scotland, under the same conviction, had the courage to declare war against him. Both the plotters and the warriors fell; but their blood watered the plant of renown, and succeeding ages have eaten the pleasant fruit.” (Charters’ Sermons, pp. 273—277 )

## CHAPTER VII.

Cruel proceedings of the council and the military—examples—death of Charles II.—accession of James VII.—extreme sufferings of the Covenanters—murder of John Brown and Andrew Hislop by Claverhouse—two women drowned at Wigton—meeting of Parliament—iniquitous acts passed by that assembly—Argyle's invasion—precautions used by the council to defeat it—prisoners sent from Edinburgh to Dunnottar castle—their barbarous treatment—Argyle defeated and taken prisoner—his execution—Rumbold and Archer put to death—James exempts the papists from all religious oaths—declaration of the Cameronians against the accession of James to the throne—continued severities—execution of John Nisbet of Hardhill.

WERE it not of necessity we should willingly forbear giving any account of the cold-blooded murders and other dreadful atrocities which were committed on the Covenanters during the year 1685. In justice to their memory, however, as well as to give a still further display of the proceedings of the persecuting government which at that period lorded it over an oppressed people—a government that can find defenders even in the present day—we shall select a few out of many instances of cruelty, oppression, and blood which this year displays.

The exorbitant fines which were imposed for non-conformity proved the ruin of tho-

sands throughout the kingdom. To fines were added imprisonment and banishment; but as if both these punishments were in themselves trifling evils, the former was aggravated by the addition of torture, and the latter by first cutting off the ears of the exiles, and then dooming them to perpetual slavery. Murders in various forms completed the scene, the instances of which are so numerous that we are at a loss which to select. The council, the military commission courts, and the soldiers, seemed to vie with each other in putting to death the greatest number of Presbyterians.

For simply not disowning the societies' declaration, Robert Millar and Robert Pollock were executed at the Gallow-lee on the 23d of January, each of whom left a testimony for the cause in which they suffered, and against all the defections of the times. (*Cloud of Witnesses*, p. 322, et seq.) On the same day six poor men being found by the military at *prayer*, in the parish of Monigaff, Galloway, were, without any trial, cruelly shot. Another party of Covenanters was surprised by a troop of horse in Nithsdale, all of whom escaped except Daniel M'Michal, who being wounded was carried

to Durrisdeer. Declining to answer a number of their ensnaring interrogatories, Dalzell said to him, "Do you not know your life is in my hand?" "No, sir," replied Daniel, "I know my life is in the Lord's hand, and if he see good, he can make you the instrument to take it away." He was then ordered to prepare for death next day; to which the good man answered, "If my life must go for his cause, I am willing; my God will prepare me." Being granted liberty to pray—a favour now very seldom conferred on the sufferers—he was shot through the head, and interred in the church-yard of Durrisdeer. A more glaring instance of cruelty was committed by Captain Bruce at Straiton in Carrick, who having put the usual questions to Thomas Machassie, while lying in the rage of a fever, and not receiving satisfactory answers, dragged him from his bed, and ordered him to be shot. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 239.)

Deeds equally illegal and atrocious were committed by the courts appointed to enforce the abjuration oath. One example of their proceedings may at present suffice. John Park and James Algie having been apprehended by the military on the 1st of Febru-

ary, were brought before the commissioners for the shire of Renfrew, condemned, and ordered to be executed. Anxious for their preservation, several of their friends prevailed with them to take the oath ; but the Laird of Orbiston, the presiding judge, informed them that swearing the abjuration oath would not save them, unless they took the test also. “ Then,” replied the two martyrs, “ if to save our lives we must take the test, and the abjuration will not save us, we will take no oath at all.” The sentence was accordingly executed ; all who attended their funeral were compelled to declare that their punishment was just ; and Orbiston exultingly exclaimed, with an oath, “ They thought to have cheated the judges, but I have cheated them.” (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 246.)

During these bloody proceedings, Charles II. was removed by death ; and though the dissolution of that monarch did not suspend, it modified for a short period the persecution against the Covenanters.

According to several accounts, the king was struck with apoplexy, (Hume’s Hist., vol. viii. p. 209,) which put a period to his life on the 6th of February. Other historians, however, say that his end was hastened by poi-

son, (See Burnet, vol. ii. p. 1047.) or other means still more dreadful, at the instigation of the Duke of York.\* But whether he died a natural death, which we more than suspect, or by violent measures, it is generally admitted that he ended his days in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. From a popish priest he received extreme unction, the pardon of all the sins which he had committed against God, and the full assurance of a crown of glory ! To give any character

\* York and his cabal, says Veitch, poisoned both the wine and the snuff which the king used at an entertainment. Next morning, "Charles finding himself 'deadly sick,' and suspecting the cause, got to the window, crying 'I'm gone, I'm poisoned.' The duke getting notice, came running in haste, all unrest, to lament his brother's fate, saying, 'Alas, Sir, what's the matter?' who answered, 'O, you know too well,' and was in great passion at him. In the mean time he called for his closet keeper to fetch him an antidote against poison ; but it could not be found, neither his physicians, being, as it was thought, sent out of town. When he saw all these things fail him, being enraged at his brother, he made at him ; but he having secured all the entries to the court, that the sentry should tell if any courtiers or bishops, upon the news, should offer to come in to see how the king was ; they were to tell them that he was gone to bed out of order, and had discharged all access to him that he might be quiet. And, in the mean time, the duke seeing him in such a rage, and that the poison was not like to do so quickly, set four ruffians upon him, at which he crying out so as he was heard, they presently choked him in his cravat, and so beat him in the head that he instantly died."—McCrie's Memoirs of Veitch, p. 163.

of this worthless monarch is almost unnecessary. From the preceding history, a scene of hypocrisy, perjury, tyranny, cruelty, we had almost added blasphemy, is exhibited against him, over which historians may attempt to throw a veil, but for which posterity, in every age, will hold his memory in just detestation. The Presbyterians, in particular, can never recall to their minds the abominable and bloody deeds of this tyrant without horror. Well might Mr. Douglass, who preached the sermon at his coronation, have addressed him in the language of that passage of Scripture which first met his eye when he sat down to choose his text, “Write ye this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days; for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah.”\* Whatever may have been his private character, which however was any thing but amiable, his open and unblushing persecution of the men who

\* Jer. xxii. 30.—It is said that Mr. Douglass never required to search long for a text; on the contrary, the first passage of Scripture which appeared when he sat down to study was usually so clear to his mind that he adopted it, and preached from it to the people. Being appointed to preach the coronation sermon in 1651, the above words first met his eye when he opened the Bible; but not willing to offend, he chose another text.

adhered to those very covenants which he once solemnly swore, but afterwards deliberately violated, must render his name infamous, and his memory odious to every genuine friend of religion and liberty throughout these kingdoms. “ His ambition,” says Fox, “ was directed against his subjects; unprincipled, ungrateful, mean, and treacherous, to which may be added, vindictive, and remorseless. I doubt whether a single instance can be produced of his having spared the life of any one whom motives of policy or revenge prompted him to destroy.”

No sooner did intelligence of the death of Charles reach Edinburgh, than the Duke of York was proclaimed king in his room, the privy council declaring James VII. “ to be their only lawful, lineal, and rightful liege lord, to whom they acknowledge all faith and constant obedience. It was deemed unnecessary to tender the coronation oath to a monarch who was declared to be “ king over all persons and in all causes, and to hold his imperial crown from God alone.” That ceremony was consequently omitted by the council, though the omission was not forgotten by the Presbyterians; and numerous adulatory addresses were sent up to London,

expressing the unbounded satisfaction which was felt by the nation at the accession of a popish prince to the throne.\*

No change being made in the administration, the council, and military, with full consent of James, continued, or rather increased the persecution against the Presbyterians. Captain Bruce having, on the 19th of February, seized six Covenanters in the parish of Kirkpatrick, Galloway, put four of them to death on the spot. The other two were carried before Grierson of Lagg, who ordered them to be hanged on an adjoining tree. Edward Kyan, in the parish of Barr, for endeavouring to elude the military lest he should be teased with their ensnaring questions, was not only shot, but his dead body used in a most barbarous manner; and his murder was followed by that of six others in a parish adjoining. Insult, too, was com-

\* Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 202.—In Wellwood's Memoirs there is a translation of some inscriptions of the most fulsome and even blasphemous kind, by the Jesuits, on the accession of James and death of his brother Charles; such as “English noblemen were sent to other kings to acquaint them with King James's accession to the crown; but Charles was the first that brought the news of it to heaven.” “It was but natural for kings to send and receive princes as ambassadors, but it became the Almighty to receive and James to send no ambassador but a king!”—p. 191.

monly added to cruelty. Mr. Bell, of Whiteside, with four other gentlemen, having been sentenced by Lagg to be instantly shot, requested only fifteen minutes to prepare for death; but he was answered by the barbarian, "What the devil, have you not had time enough since Bothwell?" and the sentence was instantly executed. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 242.)

The fury of the persecutors was exceedingly increased in consequence of the appearance of Mr. Peden, who setting the sanguinary and unjust laws of government at defiance, preached either in fields or in houses as he found opportunity. The following affecting picture of the sufferings of the Covenanters who ventured to attend upon his ministry is from the pen of one of themselves: "On the 26th of April it pleased God in his good providence, to send that great man Mr. Alexander Peden, to the gentleman's house where I was. He preached on the 10th of John, from which he spoke long and well, with application to the present time. Next morning the servants and I went to work in the fields, where before nine o'clock we saw a troop of dragoons coming at the full gallop. Mr. Peden and

those that were with him in the house fled, which we at work knew nothing of; but we ran every one as providence directed, and the watchful providence of God, which was ever kind to me, led me as by the hand to a moss, two miles distant from where we were working, to which those with Mr. Peden were fled for shelter. Two of the dragoons pursued me very hard; but spying another man following me, him they pursued off at the right hand of my way. They fired at him; but it pleased the Lord he escaped at that time. Other two of them came in chase of me. I was sore put to it for my life. The day was very hot; the sun bright in my face, and the way mountainous; yet the Lord was very kind to me, and enabled me to run. At the edge of the moss there was a bog or morass; and here the Lord was a present help in the time of need to me; for just as I was got through the bog, and drawing myself out of it by the heather of the moss, the two dragoons came to the other side; but seeing they could not get through to me with their horses, they bade me stand dog and be shot. They fired upon me; but God directed the ball by my left ear. I finding that I had escaped the shot,

ran further into the moss. Kind Providence led me just where my persecuted friends were lurking in a moss-hag, about twenty in number. We stayed there for some time, till a second troop joined the first troop ; and seeing them dismount their horses, to take the moss on their foot to search us out, after some firing on both sides, without any execution done, we drew off, and travelled the midst of the moss. They seeing this, hored again, and pursued us by the edges of the moss ; but we always kept ourselves on such ground where horses could not come. We ran that day hither and thither, forward and backward, about thirty miles. We got no manner of refreshment all that day but moss-water to drink till night, that each of us got a drink of milk. Mr. Peden left those that were with him, and went one way ; and I left them and went another. I lay all night far from any house amongst heather. The next day when I wakened, after the sun rose, I saw about two hundred foot and horse searching all the country far and near ; but seeing no way of escape unobserved by the enemy, I clapped close among the heather, and so kind and condescending was the Lord to me, that not one of the enemy came near

the place where I lay ; the Lord laying on me no more than I was able to bear.” (Mem. of James Nisbet, pp. 103—106.)

A most atrocious instance of cruelty which took place on the 29th of April, on five individuals in the parish of Glencairn, is given by Wodrow in the following simple and affecting terms : “ The occasion of their being seized, and of the taking and surprising of several others of the wanderers at this time, was this. A profligate villainous informer and apostate, Andrew Watson, pretended to be a sufferer, and last winter and this spring, went up and down among the people who were upon their hiding. By this time this base deceiver came to be tolerably well acquainted with their haunts and lurking-places, and discovered them through Galloway and Nithsdale ; and among others he made known a cave near Ingliston, which had been a place of safety and secrecy to not a few for several years. Accordingly Colonel James Douglas, and Lieutenant Livingstone, through bye-paths and unusual ways, came suddenly to this cave, and surprised in it John Gibson, heritor of the ground, James Kennoch, Robert Edgar, Robert Mitchell, and Robert Grierson. When the soldiers

came up, they shot in on the cave, and wounded one of them, and then rushed in upon them ; and without any questions asked, or offers made, Colonel Douglas immediately passed sentence upon them, to be taken out and shot, though nothing could be laid to the charge of any of them, but that they were hiding. It was much that any of them were allowed to pray before their death. John Gibson was first shot, and permitted to pray, which he did to the admiration and conviction even of the soldiers themselves. The rest were despatched all at once, without being allowed to pray separately. They had great peace and consolation, and all of them were shot dead, except one who was not perfectly killed ; and when this was observed, one Ferguson, an apostate, and once among the sufferers, now in the army, drew his sword, and thrust him through the body. When the poor man was weltering in his blood, and that of his brethren about him, he cried out, ‘Though every hair of my head were a man, I am willing to die all those deaths for Christ and his cause.’ These were his last words. They lie buried in Glencairn church-yard.” (Wodrow, vol. iv pp. 243, 244.)

But the inhuman deeds which were committed by other persecutors were far outdone by those of Claverhouse. This officer had the chief command in the west, and he employed the most disgraceful and barbarous measures against the Covenanters, endeavouring, if possible, to exterminate the whole party. He sought out and employed persons who could with the greatest address feign themselves to be pious men, and friendly to the Presbyterians, and by this means discovered their retreats, or drew them from places where they could not be attacked by his troops. Having divided the country into districts, he caused his soldiers to drive all the inhabitants of a district, like so many cattle, to a convenient place ; and while the soldiers surrounded them with charged guns and bloody threatenings, he made them swear that they owned James as rightful successor to the throne. If they had formerly taken the test or oath of abjuration, he interrogated them if they had repented of what they had done, and then caused them to swear anew, that they would not, under pain of forfeiting their part in heaven, repent of it in future. If any hesitated to swear, he was taken out, his face covered

with a napkin, and the soldiers were ordered to shoot over his head to terrify him into compliance. At other times he gathered together all the children of a district, from six to ten years of age, and having drawn up a party of soldiers before them, told them to pray, as they were going to be shot. When sufficiently frightened, he offered them their lives, provided they answered such questions as he proposed to them, concerning their parents and such as visited their houses; nay, he himself fired his own pistol twice over the head of a boy of nine years of age, to induce him to discover his father. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 256.)

So “exceedingly mad” was this champion for tyranny and slavery against all who favoured presbytery, that he frequently shot those who fell into his hands, though they were unarmed, without any form of trial; and when his soldiers, sometimes shocked at the wantonness of his cruelty, hesitated in obeying his orders, he executed them himself. We have one striking example of this kind in the case of John Brown, in the parish of Muirkirk. Brown was a man of excellent character, by employment a carrier, and no way obnoxious to government, ex-

cept for non-conformity. On the 1st of May he was at work in the fields near his own house, when Claverhouse passed on his road from Lesmahagow with three troops of dragoons. It is probable that information of his non-conformity had been given to Graham, who caused him to be brought from the fields to his own door. After some interrogatories, Claverhouse said, "John, go to your prayers, for you shall immediately die." Upon which the martyr kneeled down, and poured out his heart in language so affecting, that the soldiers, profane and hardened as they were, were moved almost to tears. He was twice interrupted in his devotions by Claverhouse; and when he had finished, the cruel wretch ordered him to take farewell of his weeping wife, and two infant children who stood beside him. "Now Isabel," said the martyr, "the day is come of which I told you when I first proposed marriage to you." "Indeed, John," she replied, "I can willingly part with you." "Then," he added, "this is all I desire: I have no more to do but die; I have been in case to meet death for many years." After he had kissed his wife and children, "wishing them

all purchased and promised blessings," Claverhouse ordered his soldiers to fire. But the prayers of the good man had made such an impression on their minds, that they decidedly refused to have any hand in his death. Irritated at the delay, Claverhouse shot him dead with his own hand, regardless of the tears and entreaties of the poor man's wife, and then turning to the widow, with wanton cruelty, asked her what she thought of her husband now? "I ever thought much good of him," she replied, "and as much now as ever." "It were but justice to lay thee beside him," rejoined the murderer. "If ye were permitted," said she, "I doubt not but your cruelty would go that length: but how will you answer for this morning's work?" "To man I can be answerable," replied the hardened villain, "*and as for God, I will take him in mine own hand! !*" and immediately rode off. The poor woman then laid her infant on the ground, gathered together the scattered brains of her beloved husband, bound up his head, covered his body with her plaid, and sat down and wept over him. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 245. Crookshank, vol. ii, p. 265.) Say, reader, what

must be the feelings of a historian who can attempt to eulogize such a man as Claverhouse?

The most hardened persecutor does not, however, always feel that tranquillity of mind which he affects. Claverhouse himself acknowledged afterwards, that John Brown's prayer left impressions on his mind which he found it impossible to eradicate ; and it is not improbable that some degree of remorse at this horrid murder, made him show considerable reluctance to another which he committed only ten days after. Having seized Andrew Hislop, he carried him with him to the house of Sir James Johnstone, of Westerraw, without any design, it would appear, to put him to death. Westerraw insisted on his immediate execution, which was at first opposed by Claverhouse ; but he at length acquiesced in it, saying, “The blood of this poor man be upon you, Westerraw ; I am free of it.” A Highland gentleman, who was traversing the country, having come that way with a company of soldiers, Claverhouse meanly endeavoured to make him the executioner of Westerraw's sentence ; but that gentleman, having more humanity, drew off his men to

some distance, and swore that he would fight Claverhouse sooner than perform such an office. Having no other alternative, Claverhouse ordered three of his own men to fire. When ready, they desired Hislop to draw his bonnet over his face ; but this the martyr decidedly refused, informing them that he had done nothing of which he had reason to be ashamed, and could look them in the face without fear ; and then holding up his bible in one of his hands, and reminding them of the account which they had to render, he received the contents of their muskets in his body. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 259.)

On the very day that Hislop suffered, viz. the 11th of May, the military commission court at Wigton committed an action still more unnatural and base. Two girls of the name of Wilson, for refusing to hear the eurates, had been intercommuned and forced to become wanderers on the mountains. Having ventured at this time to visit Margaret M'Lauchlan, an aged widow in Wigton, the three females were seized, brought before the court, and condemned to be drowned. The life of the youngest of the sisters was purchased by the father for one hundred pounds : but the other, who was about eighteen years

of age, together with the venerable and pious matron, in whose house she was apprehended, were tied to stakes within the flood-mark of the water of Blednoch. The widow being fixed furthest in, was first drowned; but her dying agonies, instead of shaking the constancy of her youthful companion, confirmed her in her resolution to prefer suffering to sin; and when taunted by her persecutors with "what her thoughts were at the sight," she replied, "What do I see but Christ and his members wrestling there? Think you that we are the sufferers? No, it is Christ in us; for 'he sends none a warfare on their own charges.'" Having sung the 25th psalm and prayed, the water flowed over her; but before she was quite dead, her executioners, with a shocking refinement in cruelty, pulled her out, and waiting till she recovered, asked her if she would pray for the king. "I wish," she replied, "the salvation of all men, and the damnation of none." One of the spectators, deeply affected, exclaimed, "Dear Margaret, say, 'God save the king.' " With the greatest composure she replied, "God save him, if he will, for it is his salvation I desire." On which several of her relatives earnestly cried to Wind-

ram, “Sir, she hath said it, she hath said it.” But the unfeeling wretch desired her to swear the abjuration oath; which having refused, she was again plunged into the water and drowned.\*

Amidst these heart-rending scenes the first parliament of James VII. met at Edinburgh. It was opened by Queensberry on the 28th of April, with a letter from the king, in which his majesty says, “That which we are at this time to propose, is, what is as necessary for your safety as our service, and what has a tendency more to secure your own privileges and properties than the aggrandizing our power and authority, though in it consists the greater security of your rights and interests, these never having been in danger except when the royal power was brought too low to protect them, which now we are resolved to maintain in its greatest lustre, to the end we may be the more enabled to de

\* Cloud of Witnesses, p. 330.—That the death of these two martyrs was *murder*, even in the eye of the base laws then in force, is evident from the following reprieve which was granted by the council, but disregarded by their executioners: “Margaret Wilson and Margaret M’Lauchlan, under sentence of death, pronounced by the justices, are continued till—and the lords of his majesty’s privy council recommend it to the secretaries to procure their remission.”—Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 249.

fend and protect your religion as established by law, and your rights and properties, against fanatical contrivances, murderers, and assassins, who having no fear of God more than honour for us, have brought you into such difficulties, as only the blessing of God upon the steady resolutions and actings of our dearest royal brother, and those employed by him in prosecution of the good and wholesome laws by you heretofore offered, could have secured you from the most horrid confusions and inevitable ruin. Nothing has been left unattempted by those wild and inhuman traitors for endeavouring to overturn your peace; and, therefore, we have good reason to hope that nothing will be wanting in you to secure yourselves and us from their outrage and violence in time coming.” (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 249.) In commenting upon this letter, the commissioner denominated the Covenanters “desperate and fanatical wretches, of such monstrous principles and practices, as past ages never heard, nor those to come will hardly believe.”\* This invective was followed up

\* The character given of the Covenanters by James and his minion is exactly what belongs to those monsters in human shape, who, placed beyond, and ruling without, all law, either divine or human, trampled upon every

by acts quite consistent with a parliament “ who had made a resignation of themselves, without reserve,” to a popish king. Three of these acts deserve particular notice. By the first it was declared, “ That the giving or taking the national covenant, as explained in the year 1638, or of the league and covenant, (commonly so called,) or writing in defence thereof, or owning them as lawful or obligatory upon themselves or others, shall infer the crime and pains of treason.” The second of these acts converted the illegal practices of the council into a law. “ Considering,” said this statute, “ that the lords of the privy council, and others commissionate by his majesty and them, have fined husbands for their wives withdrawing from ordinances, the parliament declares the said procedure to have been legal, and ordains the same to be observed in all time coming.” And by the third, the sentence of forfeiture, and all the proceedings against Porterfield of Duchal, were confirmed, “ declaring the same to be agreeable to the laws of the kingdom,

thing sacred, and delighted in nothing so much as in pouring out like water the blood of the saints. The ages to come will, indeed, hardly believe that such barbarians as James, Queensberry, and their coadjutors were ever placed at the head of a Christian community.

and that the concealing or not revealing of supplies given to or demanded for traitors, is treason, and to be judged accordingly."

In addition to these iniquitous acts, the parliament extended the punishment of death to hearers as well as preachers at conventicles; declaring the worshipping of God in a private house, if five individuals more than the members of the family were present, to be treason; and ordered the test to be imposed on all heritors, liferenters, and tacks-men, *papists alone excepted*. The proceedings of this disgraceful parliament were finished by the forfeiture of a great number of gentlemen, and annexing their estates for ever to the crown. (Fountainhall's Decisions, vol. i. p. 36, et seq. Laing, vol. iii. p. 167. Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 259, et seq.)

Before the rising of parliament, the Earl of Argyle, according to previous agreement with the Duke of Monmouth, and a number of exiled gentlemen, sailed with an expedition for Scotland, with the view of "recovering the religion, rights, and liberties of that kingdom."\* No sooner did intelligence

\* The meeting by which this expedition was agreed upon, was held at Amsterdam on the 17th of April. The persons present were the Earl of Argyle, Mr. Charles

of this expedition reach the ears of the council, than every precaution was used to defeat the invasion. The whole fencible men in the country were called out ; the heritors in Argyleshire were summoned to Edinburgh ; and the earl's relatives were secured. All this was what might have been expected ; but the dreadful cruelty which was inflicted on many of the Covenanters, who were at that period shut up in prison, can admit of no apology. On the 18th of May these prisoners, both men and women, to the number of about two hundred and forty, were suddenly collected, hurried down to Leith, and conveyed in open boats to Burnt-island. Here they were crammed into two small rooms in the tolbooth, scarcely sufficient to contain the third part of them, and, without regard to age or sex, detained there for two days without being permitted to have even bread and water. At length the oath of supremacy was tendered to them, which was accepted by about forty only, who were

Campbell his son, Sir John Cochrane of Ochiltree, Sir Patrick Hume of Polwart, George Pringle of Torwoodlee, William Denholm of Westshiel, George Hume of Bassindean, John Cochrane of Waterside, Mr. George Wisheart, William Cleland, James Stuart, advocate, and Mr. Gilbert Elliot.—*Memoirs of Brysson*, p. 311.

sent back to Edinburgh; the rest refusing to confer the headship of the church on an avowed papist. The hands of these two hundred victims were then tied behind their backs, and they were driven north by the military. The sufferings which they endured on their journey, chiefly from the cruelty of their drivers, were such, that several of them died, and not a few contracted diseases from which they never recovered. They arrived at Dunnottar, the place of their destination, on the 24th of May, and were thrust into a dark vault in the castle that had but one small window, and was full of mire ankle-deep. In this dreadful place they were pent up almost the whole summer, without air, without ease, without room either to lie or walk, and without any comfort except what they enjoyed from heaven. They were obliged to purchase the very worst of provisions at an exorbitant rate; and even water was refused them without money. Unable to answer the exorbitant demands of their persecutors, many of them soon died, or were rather either famished, or suffocated, which induced the governor to remove them to other apartments; and about the end of the year such as survived were

sent to the plantations and sold for slaves. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 323. Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 278.)

Argyle arrived at Orkney on the 4th of May, with about three hundred men; but being prevented from landing, he sailed to Argyleshire, where he published a declaration, which seems to have had but little effect. He was accompanied by Sir Patrick Hume and Sir John Cochrane, who in several instances opposed his measures, which hastened, unintentionally indeed, the disastrous termination of the expedition. Opposed by an army of twenty-two thousand men, Argyle, whose followers never exceeded twenty-five hundred, after spending five weeks in the Highlands, where his arms and ammunition were seized, his provisions cut off, and his army diminished, resolved to penetrate into the Lowlands. Harassed by the numerous parties which were sent to oppose him, and worn out with hunger and fatigue, he at length reached Dumbarton, where, discovering a large party of horse in front, he resolved to try Glasgow. After wandering about for a short time longer, he arrived at Kilpatrick with no more than five hundred men; and in a few days afterwards

his followers were defeated and dispersed, and himself taken prisoner. (Sir Patrick Hume's Narrative, p. 63.)

The very day Argyle was apprehended, about seventy of his followers, under the command of Sir John Cochrane, made a bold and successful stand against several troops of dragoons, which is thus related by one who shared in the combat :—“ When we were advanced a good way up the hill,” at a place called Muirdyke, on the east of Lochwinnoch, the king’s troops “ came suddenly upon us, and after firing thought to have ridden us down; but Sir John cries, ‘ Come up, my lads, and stand to it, and through God’s grace I will bring you off.’ Though there was little appearance thereof, yet we took courage, knowing the worst of it. And after we had received their fire, we discharged upon them very vigorously, and then betook us to our halberts, so that we made them retire. Then my Lord Ross sent one to treat with us, who told us we were pretty men; why would we throw away our lives? would we not take quarters? To which Sir John said, ‘ We disdain your quarters . for we are appearing here for the Protestant religion, and ye are fighting for Pe-

pery, for which ye ought to be ashamed.' So he returned with his answer. In the mean time we got into an old stone fold, which was a little defence to us. Sir John divided us, and set one half on his right hand, and the other on his left, and gave orders to all to 'charge and make ready,' and ordered those on his left hand first to receive the enemy's fire, and after that not to fire till he gave them a sign. The enemy approached, and we received their fire, but fired none again until they came very near ; and then Sir John gave the sign to those on his right hand, who gave a very close fire. The enemy not knowing but our shot had been done, attempted to come over the dyke, and break in amongst us, but the lads on the right hand defended bravely. Then Sir John gave the sign to those on the left, who fired furiously upon the enemy, so that several of their saddles were emptied, and amongst the rest Captain Cleland was shot dead at the very dyke side, so that they were forced to wheel again." A third attack was equally unsuccessful, the dragoons being beaten off with considerable loss. Sir John then said, " It becomes us to bless God for our wonderful preservation," upon which the whole

party immediately kneeled down and offered up their grateful thanks to Him, who can and often does make one chase a thousand. (McCrie's Memoirs of Brysson, p. 325, et seq.)

Argyle was brought to Edinburgh on the 20th of June, and conducted from the Watergate to the castle in a manner pretty similar to that of Hackston of Rathillet. The open avowal of his intention to overturn the existing tyrannical government, alone saved him from the torture; and he was condemned, on the unjust and arbitrary sentence formerly pronounced on him to be executed, and his head to be fixed on the tolbooth of Edinburgh.\* On the 30th, the day of his execution, he dined at his usual hour with great cheerfulness, and then as was his custom, retired to his closet to enjoy a little repose. While in bed, one of the members of council came to him with a message, and naturally disbelieving the information that his lordship was asleep, he insisted on seeing him. The door was accordingly softly opened, when beholding the earl enjoying a tran-

\* Fountainhall's Decisions, vol. i. p. 366. Burnet, vol. iii. p. 1084. "His death," says the last of these writers, "being pursuant to the sentence past three years before, was looked on as no better than murder."

quil slumber, he hurried out of the castle, and repairing to a relative's house in the neighbourhood, threw himself on a bed in the greatest agony of mind. Being asked the cause of his trouble, he replied, "I have been at Argyle, and saw him sleeping as pleasantly as ever a man did within an hour of eternity ; but as for me——" (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 302.)

After a short repose, Argyle was conducted from the castle to the "laigh council-house," where he wrote the following short letter to his lady :

" Dear Heart—As God is of himself unchangeable, so he hath been always good and gracious to me, and no place alters it ; only I acknowledge, I am sometimes less capable of a due sense of it ; but now above all my life, I thank God I am sensible of his presence with me, with great assurance of his favour through Jesus Christ, and I doubt not it will continue till I be in glory. Forgive me all my faults, and now comfort thyself in him in whom only true comfort is to be found. The Lord be with thee, bless thee, and comfort thee, my dearest. Adieu. My dear, thy faithful and loving husband,  
ARGYLE."

The earl then proceeded to the scaffold, which he ascended not only with firmness, but with heavenly joy. Turning to the spectators, he said, "I shall not now say any thing of my sentence or escape about three years and a half ago, nor of the ground of my return, lest I may thereby give offence or be tedious. That I intend mainly to say now is, to express my humble, and I thank God cheerful submission to his divine will, and my willingness to forgive all men, even mine enemies; and I am heartily well satisfied there is no more blood spilt, and I shall wish the stream of it may stop at me. We are neither to despise our afflictions, nor faint under them; both are extremes. We are not to suffer our spirits to be exasperated against the instruments of our trouble, for the same affliction may be an effect of their passion, yet sent to punish us for our sins. I do hereby forgive all that directly or indirectly have been the cause of my being brought to this place, and pray God may forgive them. I pray God send peace and truth to these three kingdoms, and continue and increase the glorious light of the gospel, and restrain a spirit of profaneness, atheism,

oppression, popery, and persecution, and restore all that have backslidden from the purity of their life or principles.”\* He then turned to the south side of the scaffold, and said, “ Gentlemen, I pray you do not misconstrue my behaviour this day. I freely forgive all men their wrongs and injuries done against me, as I desire to be forgiven of God.” Mr. Annand, an Episcopal clergyman who was appointed to attend him, repeated these words louder to the people, adding, “ This nobleman dies a Protestant.” The earl immediately stept forward, and said, “ I die not only a Protestant, but with a heart-hatred of popery, prelacy, and all superstition whatsoever.” Having taken leave of his friends,

\* Wodrow, vol. iv p. 306.—It may be gratifying to the reader to read the following lines, which were written by Argyle the day before his execution:

“Thou passenger, that shalt have so much time  
 To view my grave, and ask what was my crime :  
 No stain of error, no black vice’s brand  
 Was that which chased me from my native land.  
 Love to my country, twice sentenced to die,  
 Constrained my hands forgotten arms to try.  
 More by my friends’ fraud my fall proceeded hath  
 Than foes ; though now they twice decreed my death.  
 On my attempt though Providence did frown,  
 His oppressed people God at length shall own.  
 Another hand by more successful speed,  
 Shall raise the remnant, bruise the serpent’s head.  
 Though my head fall, that is no tragic story,  
 Since going hence I enter endless glory.”

he kneeled down, and embracing the maiden\* said, “This is the sweetest maiden I ever kissed, it being the mean to finish my sin and misery, and my inlet to glory, for which I long.” After praying for a few minutes, he laid his head on the block, and with these words in his mouth, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,” his head was severed from his body. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 305. Scots Worthies, p. 547.)

The suppression of this invasion, both in England and Scotland, was followed by the most dreadful cruelties. In England, on the defeat† and execution of Monmouth and his coadjutors, the bloody Jeffries put to death multitudes who had no concern whatever in that unsuccessful expedition. In Scotland, the vengeance of the council fell on all who bore the Presbyterian name. Six individuals were apprehended about the same time with Argyle, namely, Sir John Cochrane, Ayloffef‡ Rumbold, Thomas Archer, Gavin Russel, and David Law, the last four

\* The name given to the instrument of death.

† Monmouth was defeated at Bridgewater on the 6th of July.

‡ Sir John Cochrane and Ayloffef were sent to London, where the former was pardoned in consequence of a high ransom paid by his father, and the latter executed.

mentioned of whom were executed at Edinburgh.

The death of Rumbold was attended by cruelties the most revolting, his sentence being nearly the same with that of Hackston. He was so much weakened by his wounds, that he required to be supported to the scaffold by two officers, where he addressed the spectators in a speech to the following import :—“ It is appointed for all men once to die, and after death the judgment, and seeing death is a debt all of us must pay, it is a matter of small moment and consequence what way it be done; but seeing the Lord is pleased to take me to himself in this manner, as it is somewhat terrible to flesh and blood, yet, glory to him, it is not terrible to me.” He then proceeded to explain his principles, “ blessing God that it was for no transgression of the divine law, but for owning and adhering to his distressed work and interest that such a lot was carved out for him,” when he was interrupted by the beating of drums, at which he shook his head, saying, “ Will they not suffer a dying man to speak his last words to the people?” He went on, however, declaring his confidence in the justice of the cause he was engaged in, and

added, “ I confess enemies think they have got their feet on the neck of the Protestant interest now ; but I am persuaded, it is as true as I am this day entering into eternity, that Christ shall be glorious in these lands, and even in poor Scotland, and that shortly : and, it is like, many who see me die this day may be witnesses thereof ; yea, He shall govern these nations with a rod of iron, and that to the terror of his enemies.” While praying for the extirpation of popery, prelacy, and every other superstition, the drums were again beat ; upon which he submitted himself to the hands of the executioner, and died rejoicing in the Lord. (Scots Worthies, p. 550.)

Mr. Archer, a young and amiable minister, who was put to death on the 21st of August, left a large testimony to the cause for which he suffered. “ It was always my judgment,” said he, “ and I hope to die in it, that the obligation of the covenants is national and in dissoluble, and that even the posterity renouncing them shall be found guilty of horrid perjury and apostasy before God, since in them we first engaged immediately to serve him. I have lived, and desire to die, hoping that the Lord will yet glorify his grace and

gospel in the land, and that he hath not brought us under the bond of the covenant immediately to cast us off (though we deserve it,) but that the children which are yet to be created may praise him." When on the scaffold he said, "My motives for coming to Scotland in the manner I did, were the great apprehension I had of popery, and my regard to the kingdom and interest of Christ here ; and I wish every one were concerned with the evils and dangers of popery." Being interrupted by one of the magistrates, he said, "You cannot deny but popery is hazardous, Rev. xiv. 9—11." "True, but there is no fear of it here," replied the other. "I wish to God it be so," rejoined Mr. Archer ; "and what I have further to say is, that as Christ hath a kingdom wherein and over which he reigneth as king, so he will suffer none to usurp that power which is his own prerogative." Having spoken a few minutes longer amidst great interruption, he sung and prayed, and then yielded up his spirit into the hands of his Redeemer. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 317.)

The death of these two individuals was followed by that of many throughout the country. Upwards of twenty who were ap-

prehended in the Highlands were hanged at Inverness, and vast multitudes, equally adverse to popery and tyranny, were banished to the plantations.

As a proper accompaniment to these sanguinary measures against the Presbyterians, James, by his dispensing power, exempted the Roman Catholics from the oaths and test appointed by law. "There is a clause," says he in a letter to the council, dated November 7, "in the act of supply, ordaining all the commissioners therein named, to take the oaths and test appointed by law, which clause we judge fit for our service, to require you to put vigorously in execution, excepting those in the list here inclosed, whom we have dispensed with from taking the same, and such as we shall hereafter dispense with under our royal hand." This mandate was implicitly obeyed by the council, who, while they showed an equal desire with their popish master to relieve the scruples of the Roman Catholics, continued to persecute to death the Presbyterians for their conscientious attachment to the principles of the Reformation. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 347.)

James was no doubt encouraged in his persecuting schemes by the dismal proceed-

ings which took place this year in France—proceedings which opened the eyes of multitudes in Britain to the horrid nature of popery, and assisted in paving the way for the extirpation of the bigoted race of the Stuarts from the kingdom. Notwithstanding the solemn edict framed at Nantz in 1598 by Henry IV. in favour of the Protestants, the intolerant and blood-thirsty Louis XIV. thought proper this year to revoke it, in consequence of which, liberty of conscience was completely abolished, all the Protestant churches were destroyed, their books suppressed, their ministers banished, and an order was issued to take their children from them, and put them into the hands of their Roman Catholic relatives, that they might be educated in the popish religion. Every prison in France was soon filled with Protestants; a price was set on the heads of the rest, who were hunted by the soldiers like wild beasts; and, in short, about a twentieth part of the whole body in a few months fell by the sword.\* But to return to Scotland.

\* Burnet, vol. iii. p. 1125. Hume, vol. viii. p. 243. "This year," says Burnet, "must ever be remembered as a most fatal year to the Protestant religion. In February, the king of England declared himself a papist. In June, Charles the Elector Palatine dying without is-

Notwithstanding the anxiety of the society people, or Cameronians as they were called, to obtain deliverance for themselves and the nation from that intolerable yoke under which they groaned, they decidedly refused to join with Argyle. While they lamented his death they declared that they could not join in “his expedition, on account of the too promiscuous admittance of persons to trust in that party who were then and have discovered themselves since, to be enemies to the cause; and because they could not espouse their declaration as the state of their quarrel, being not concerted according to the constant plea of the Scots Covenanters.” (Hind Let Loose, p. 164. Life of Renwick, p. 96.) Against the accession of the Duke of York to the throne, however, they published a large and pointed declaration, in which they say: “The Lord having removed Charles by death, and a few

sue, the electoral dignity went to the house of Newburgh, a most bigoted popish family. In October the king of France recalled and vacated the edict of Nantz; and in December the Duke of Savoy being brought to it, not only by the persuasions, but even by the threatenings of the court of France, recalled the edict that his father had granted to the Vaudois (Waldenses). So it must be confessed that this was a very critical year.” Hist., vol. ii. p. 1120.

wicked and unprincipled men having proclaimed James, Duke of York, though a professed papist and excommunicated person, to be king of Scotland, &c. ; we, the contending and suffering remnant of the true Presbyterians of the church of Scotland, do here deliberately, jointly, and unanimously protest against the foresaid proclamation ; in regard that it is choosing a murderer to be a governor, who hath shed the blood of the saints—the height of confederacy with an idolater, which is forbidden by the law of God—contrary to the declaration of the assembly 27th July 1649, and to many wholesome and laudable acts of parliament, and inconsistent with the safety, faith, conscience, and Christian liberty of a Christian people, to choose a subject of antichrist to be their supreme magistrate.—Also conceiving that this pretended parliament is not a lawful parliament, in regard that the election of commissioners is limited—that the members are convicted of avowed perjury, are men of blood, the chief being convict of avowed perjury ;—we do, in like manner, upon these and many other important grounds and reasons, protest against the validity and constitution of this present parliament, and their

proceeding to any approbation or ratification of the foresaid proclamation.—And further, seeing bloody papists, the subjects of anti-christ, are become so hopeful, bold, and confident, under the perfidy of the said James, Duke of York, and popery itself like to be intruded again upon these covenanted lands, and an open door being made thereunto by its accursed and abjured harbinger Prelacy, which these three kingdoms are equally sworn against; we do, in like manner, protest against all kind of popery, in general and particular heads—abjured most explicitly by our national covenant, abrogated, annulled, and rescinded by our acts of parliament, and against its entering again into this land, and against every thing that doth or may, directly or indirectly, make way for the same.—Finally, we being misrepresented to many as persons of murdering and assassinating principles, all which principles and practices we do hereby declare, before God, angels, and men, that we abhor, renounce, and detest; as also all manner of robbing of any, whether open enemies or others, which we are most falsely aspersed with, either in their gold, their silver, or their gear, or any household stuff. Their money

perish with themselves; the Lord knows that our eyes are not after these things. And in like manner, we do hereby disclaim all unwarrantable practices committed by any few persons reputed to be of us—as the unwarrantable manner of killing the curate of Carsphairn, &c.; for we call the living God, the searcher of hearts, to witness, that this only is our sincere desire and unfeigned resolution, to continue in the profession and obedience of the true religion of Jesus Christ, according to his word, our covenants national and solemn league, to defend the same, and resist all contrary errors, corruptions, and innovations, according to our vocation, and utmost of the power that God doth or may put in our hands.” (Informatory Vindication, p. 101, et seq.)

As this declaration, however, was comparatively disregarded by the council, the persecution was continued without the smallest abatement. Banishment to the plantations, after cutting off the prisoners’ ears, tortures and cold-blooded murders in the fields, or in private houses, were now become almost every day occurrences. “The carnage,” says Fox, “became every day more general and more indiscriminate; and the murder of

peasants in their houses, or while employed at their usual work in the fields, by the soldiers, was not only not reproved or punished, but deemed a meritorious service by their superiors."

Neither were the council and justiciary court inactive. On the 6th of August, Thomas Stoddart, James Wilkinson, and Matthew Bryce, were tried, found guilty, and condemned to be executed on the 12th. The first mentioned of these martyrs had received sentence of banishment, but, with the usual *justice* of government, he was subsequently tried for his life. No witnesses were adduced; and two questions only were put to the prisoners: "Will ye take the oath of allegiance? Will ye own the authority?" These were all the interrogatories deemed necessary; and upon their refusing to acknowledge that authority except in so far as it was agreeable to the word of God, their doom was sealed. These three martyrs "finished their course with joy," dying in the firm belief of being "ever with the Lord." (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 332.)

But we shall close the history of this dismal year, by giving some account of the trial and execution of John Nisbet of Hardhilt.

This eminent Christian, and staunch Covenanter, had appeared in arms both at Pentland and Bothwell, and was employed in publishing several of the declarations emitted by the Covenanters. He was of course particularly obnoxious to the government. At length, in November this year, with three of his companions in tribulation, he was surprised in a house in the parish of Fenwick, by Lieutenant Nisbet, his own cousin. His companions were killed on the spot; but he himself, after being dreadfully wounded, was seized and bound, his cousin, at the same time, insultingly inquiring at him, what he now thought of himself. "I think as much of Christ and his cause, for which I suffer, as ever," replied the good man; "but I judge myself at a loss, being in time, and my dear brethren, whom you have murdered, in eternity." The lieutenant, with an oath, told him that he had reserved him for a further judgment. "If the Lord stand by me," rejoined Nisbet, "and help me to be faithful to the death, I care not what piece of suffering I be put to endure."

Being then conveyed to Edinburgh—where his cousin demanded and obtained

the sum offered for his apprehension—he was immediately carried before the council and examined as follows:—“*Q.* Was you at the conventicle (naming the time and place)? *A.* Yes. *Q.* How many men and arms were there? *A.* I went there to hear the gospel preached, and not to take an account of what men and arms were there. *Q.* Which way went ye when the preaching was done? *A.* The way we could best think of to escape your cruelty. *Q.* Where keep you your meetings? *A.* In the wildest moors and most retired places. *Q.* What do ye at these meetings? *A.* We sing part of a psalm, read the Scriptures, and pray time about. *Q.* What is done at your general meetings? [When about to answer, one of the counsellors interrupted him, stating, according to his idea of their proceedings, what was done at these meetings, adding that there was one of them kept in Edinburgh, and inquiring if the prisoner was there. To which he replied, that he was not.] *Q.* We hope you are so much of a Christian as to pray for the king? *A.* Prayer being an holy ordinance of God, we ought to pray for kings as well as others; but not when every profligate bids us. *Q.* Do you own the king as sole

sovereign? *A.* He being popish, and I a protestant of the Presbyterian covenanted persuasion, I neither can nor will own him while he remains such. *Q.* Were you and such as you clear to join with Argyle? *A.* No more than with you. *Q.* Would you have joined with Monmouth? *A.* No. "It seems," said one of them in jest, "they will have no king but Mr. Renwick," and inquired if he conversed with any other minister than Mr. Renwick, to which he replied that he did not.

Mr. Nisbet was indicted before the justiciary court on the 30th of November, for "being at Drumclog and Glasgow at the rebellion, fighting against his majesty's forces, being at a late field conventicle, and in arms and opposition to his majesty's forces when apprehended." He was found guilty on his own confession, and condemned to be executed in the Grassmarket on the 4th of December. In his last testimony, he says, "However it be that many, both ministers and professors, are turning their backs upon Christ and his cross—yet let not this weaken your hands; for I assure you it will not be long to the fourth watch; and then he will come in garments dyed in blood, to raise up

saviours upon Mount Zion, to judge the Mount of Esau, and then the house of Jacob and Joseph shall be for fire, and the malignants, prelates, and papists shall be for stubble, the flame whereof shall be great. But my generation-work being done with my time, I go to him who loved me and washed me from all my sins.”\*



## CHAPTER VIII.

State of the persecution — death of Mr. Peden — growth of Popery — riot in Edinburgh — divisions among the Covenanters — proceedings of parliament regarding the Roman Catholics — James grants toleration to the Papists by his own prerogative — proclamation against Mr. Renwick — continued persecution — examples — Informatory Vindication published — James's first and second indulgences rejected by the Presbyterians — a third indulgence proclaimed — it is accepted by the greater part of the ministers — their address to the king — reasons of the society people for refusing the indulgence — their sufferings.

DURING 1686, and the two succeeding years, some mitigation took place in the persecution against the Presbyterians. The greater part of their ministers had been banished; those

\* Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 238 Cloud of Witnesses, p. 338, et seq. “My father was the *tenth* of my nearest relations,” says his son, “that suffered death within the compass of seven years, to seal the noble cause with their blood.” Mem. of Nisbet, p. 134.

in the higher ranks attached to their cause, were either dead or forfeited ; while multitudes of the people had been murdered, transported, imprisoned, or forced into a seeming compliance with Episcopacy. The work of persecution therefore necessarily languished for want of objects on which the cruelty of government might be exercised ; and it is not at all improbable that it would, in a great measure, have ceased, had not the conscientious and unyielding followers of Renwick furnished the council and the military with renewed excuses for persevering in their deeds of cruelty and blood. James, besides, had formed the resolution of repealing the penal statutes against the Roman Catholics ; and until that measure was fully accomplished, it was necessary that some mitigation should take place in the persecution against the Presbyterians. The antipathy of government to the Covenanters was however still the same, of which we shall have but too many instances in the history of the period which intervenes between this year and the revolution.

The fines which continued to be exacted for non-conformity were most exorbitant. One poor man, for example, in the parish of

Calder, was fined in two hundred pounds Scots for permitting a meeting for *prayer* to be held in his house, and those who were present, whether men or women, were compelled to pay sums correspondingly oppressive. The gift of these and of numerous other fines was conferred on William Stirling, one of the bailies of Glasgow, who exacted upwards of a thousand pounds Scots, in one parish alone, from the lower class of the people, without either citation or trial. An officer was despatched by him to the different houses in the parish, who threatened the inhabitants with immediate imprisonment, unless they gave him a bond for a certain sum of money, to be paid on a given day. Having no other alternative, the poor people were forced to comply, and to sell their horse or their cow to answer the bond when it became due. All these extortions were committed on persons who were regular hearers of the curates, but the sums of which they were robbed were pretended to be the punishment due to them for non-conformity several years before this period. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 356.)

Denied the privilege of houses, many of the Presbyterians resorted to the woods for

the purpose of pouring out their hearts unto God; but even there they were interrupted, and when seized put to death on the spot. Yet notwithstanding these atrocities, the followers of Renwick persevered, not only in meeting together in private for mutual edification, but in resorting to those places where the word of life was faithfully and fearlessly preached by their minister, and other distinguished ambassadors of Christ by whom he was now assisted.

To the unspeakable regret of the Presbyterians, Mr. Alexander Peden — who had proved the means under God of comforting, edifying, and converting many, and whose memory was long held in grateful remembrance by the Covenanters—was removed by death from all his sufferings, on the 26th of January. Before his dissolution he requested an interview with Mr. Renwick, at whom he had manifested some displeasure, in consequence of the false accusations of several unworthy professors. On Mr. Renwick informing him of his principles, however, Mr. Peden was completely satisfied, and express-

\* Faithful Contendings, p. 182.—Messrs. David Houston from Ireland, and Alexander Shields, the last mentioned of whom had recently escaped from prison, about this period joined Mr. Renwick. Life of Renwick, p. 118.

ed himself in the terms following:—“Sir, you have answered to my soul’s satisfaction; I am very sorry that I should have believed such ill reports of you, which not only quenched my love to, and marred my sympathy with you, but made me express myself so bitterly against you, for which I have sorely sinarted. Go on in a single dependence upon the Lord, and ye will get honestly through and clear off the stage, when many others who hold their heads high will lie in the mire and make foul hands and garments.” (Life of Peden, p. 54. Scots Worthies, p. 421.) After Mr. Peden’s body was interred, it was raised by a party of the military, and reinterred at the foot of the gibbet in Cumnock—another proof of the inhumanity of the persecutors, whose malice extended to the very dead in their graves.\*

\* The following interesting sketch of Mr. Peden’s method of preaching cannot but gratify the reader:—“Although every act of worship that Mr. Peden was engaged in was full of sublime flights and useful digressions, yet they carried alongst with them a divine stamp; and every opening of his mouth seemed for most part to be dictated by the Spirit; and such was the weighty and convincing majesty that accompanied what he spoke, that it obliged his hearers both to love and fear him. He spoke often to the commendation of those who had really closed with Christ Jesus, by the power of his Holy Spirit, on gospel terms, and were willing to take up his cross, and venture their all for him.”—Mem. of Nisbet, p. 183.

The growth of popery kept pace with the suppression of Presbyterianism. The clergy were prohibited from preaching against the religion of the monarch; no book that condemned the Romish faith was allowed to be sold; and meetings were held in which mass was publicly celebrated. Disgusted at these open indications of the partiality of government for the idolatries of Rome, a crowd, chiefly of boys, collected at the popish chapel in Edinburgh on the last Sabbath of January, and, while the people were dismissing, insulted several of the dignitaries who had countenanced the religion sworn against by the nation. (Burnet's Hist., vol. iii. p. 1157.) Some of the boys were apprehended and ordered to be whipped through the city, which occasioning a new riot, the military interfered, and a woman and two boys were killed. This tumult was construed by the council into a premeditated insurrection against the government, and an exaggerated account of it was immediately forwarded to London. In return, James sent a letter to the council, dated 9th February, in which he says, "It is our express pleasure that you try into the bottom of this matter, to find out those that have, either by money, insinuation,

or otherwise, set on this rabble, to that villainous attempt, or encouraged them in it, and therefore, that for the finding of this out, you spare no legal trial, by torture or otherwise ; this being of so great importance, that nothing more displeasing to us, or more dangerous to our government, could possibly have been contrived, and we shall spare no expenses to know the rise of it.” Agreeably to this furious mandate, several of the more active in the riot were tried, and one was executed ; the students at the college of Edinburgh were commanded to subscribe a bond, declaring their abhorrence of all tumults ; and a new pretext was furnished for treating the Covenanters with still greater severity. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 398.)

In addition to the sufferings to which the Covenanters were subjected from the council and military, they were distressed by divisions among themselves. Numbers of Presbyterians throughout the country, perceiving that they must either abandon their principles, or join with the followers of Mr. Renwick, preferred the latter alternative ; but while by their numbers they increased the ranks of the friends of religion and liberty, they at the same time engendered division

and strife, both into the district and general meetings of the Covenanters. (Faithful Contendings, p. 227.) Scarcely a meeting of the societies was held at which some of their number did not oppose and endeavour to thwart their measures, and when disappointed in their schemes, they usually abandoned the party, and vented their chagrin in disgraceful and unfair accusations. At a general meeting of the followers of Renwick, held on the 28th of January, a long and tedious debate took place regarding a union with all Presbyterians throughout the kingdom. The chief supporters of this scheme manifested afterwards the latitudinarianism of their principles; but while they are to be blamed for their departures from the original principles of the Covenanters, Mr. Renwick and his adherents evinced a spirit too contracted, and sacrificed peace to some points of minor importance, which considering the circumstances in which they were placed, ought never to have been made a subject of contention. Yet it is very easy for us to pronounce a judgment on the proceedings of these Covenanters. Had we been placed in their situation, we might, perhaps, have seen the necessity of refusing to give up one iota

of what we were persuaded to be truth, and agreeable to the word of God.\*

Meantime the king, determined on accomplishing his favourite project of relieving the Roman Catholics from the disabilities under which they were placed by the laws, summoned a parliament to meet at Edinburgh on the 29th of April. The Earl of Moray was appointed commissioner, and great efforts were made to induce the members either to acquiesce in the measures of government, or to remain silent. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 358.)

On the day appointed, the parliament was opened by Moray, who produced a letter from his majesty, the greater part of which was occupied with encomiums on the Roman Catholics. "We cannot be unmindful of our innocent subjects," says James, "those of the Roman Catholic religion, who have, with the hazard of their lives and fortunes,

\* Wodrow gives a very partial account of these disputes, stating the accusations of Cathcart and others—who opposed the decision of the societies—against Mr. Renwick and his adherents, but omitting the answers which were returned. For a full account of these debates, see *Faithful Contendings*, *Hind Let Loose*, and *Life of Renwick*. In the last mentioned of these works Cathcart receives a very different character from that given of him by Wodrow.

been always assistant to the crown in the worst of rebellions and usurpations, though they lay under discouragements hardly to be named ; them we do heartily recommend to your care, to the end, that as they have given good experience of their true loyalty and peaceable behaviour, so, by your assistance, they may have the protection of our laws, and that security under our government, which others of our subjects have, not suffering them to lie under obligations which their religion cannot admit of. By doing whereof you will give a demonstration of the duty and affection you have for us and do us most acceptable service." (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 360.) The demands of the king were enforced by the commissioner in a very artful and flattering speech. " His majesty," said the commissioner, while strongly pleading the cause of the papists, " rests fully persuaded of your ready and cheerful compliance with his royal desire and inclinations, tending so much to your own security and his satisfaction ; and that you will send me back to him, my great and royal master, with the good tidings of the continued and dutiful loyalty of this his ancient kingdom,

by which you will show yourselves the best and most affectionate subjects, to the best, the most incomparable, and most heroic prince in the world.” (Fount. vol. i. p. 415.) This speech was, however, received with any thing but the usual applause of former parliaments. Nay, in the very answer which was returned to his majesty’s letter, this parliament showed a spirit which we have looked for in vain from their predecessors. “ As to that part of your majesty’s letter,” say they, “ relating to your subjects of the Roman Catholic religion, we shall, in obedience to your majesty’s commands, and with tenderness to their persons, take the same into our serious and most dutiful consideration, and go as great lengths therein as our consciences will allow, not doubting that your majesty will be careful to secure the Protestant religion.”\* After many fruitless efforts to obtain a toleration for the Roman Catholics even to meet for public worship, the court party found it necessary to abandon

\* Burnet, vol. iii. p. 1160. Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 364  
“ This is the first time since the restoration,” adds the last mentioned author, “ that the parliament speak of their consciences; and instead of passing an act in favour of religion, as was ordinary in every parliament, they become humble suitors that a popish king may preserve it, and carefully secure it.”

their project, and the parliament was prorogued.\*

Several of the bishops were exceedingly active in endeavouring to obtain the complete toleration of popery. "Ross and Paterson," says Burnet, "so entirely forgot what became of their character, that they used their utmost endeavours to persuade the parliament to comply with the king's desire. These two governing bishops resolved to let the king see how compliant they would be. Accordingly, they procured an address to be signed by several of their bench, offering to concur with the king in all that he desired with relation to those of his own religion (for the courtly style now was, not to name popery any other way than by calling it *the king's religion*,) provided the laws might still continue in force and be executed against the Presbyterians. (Burnet, vol. iii. p. 1161.) It ought, however, to be added, that a few of the bishops did oppose the unreasonable demands of James, for which the archbishop of Glasgow and the bishop of Dunkeld were deprived of their benefices.†

Foiled in his attempts to obtain the sanc-

\* This was James's last parliament.

† The author last quoted, says, that Paterson was made

tion of the legislature to relieve the papists from the restrictive laws under which they were placed, James, “by his sovereign prerogative,” thought proper to repeal these obnoxious laws himself, and at the same time to make a considerable alteration in the administration, placing the most noted Roman Catholics in places of trust. All this was accomplished by a letter to the council, dated 21st August, in which are contained the following unblushing sentiments and arbitrary commands: “It was not any doubt we had of our power, in the putting a stop to the unreasonable severities of the acts of parliament against those of the Roman Catholic religion, that made us bring in our designs to our parliament, but to give our loyal subjects a new opportunity of showing their duty to us, their justice towards the innocent, and their charity towards their neighbours; in which we promised ourselves their hearty and dutiful concurrence, as what was founded on that solid justice we are resolved to distribute to all, and consequently to our Catholic subjects. As we have performed

archbishop of Glasgow; and that one Hamilton, “noted for profaneness and impiety, that sometimes broke into blasphemy,” was made bishop of Dunkeld.

our part in supporting those of the Protestant religion, the professors whereof are perfectly under our royal protection, so we resolve to protect our Catholic subjects against all the insults of their enemies, and severity of the laws made against them heretofore; notwithstanding of all which, we hereby allow to them the free private exercise of their religion in houses, in which we authorize and require you to support and maintain them, as under our royal protection, in all things, as well their persons as estates; and we hereby discharge any sentences to be given against any of them for the things above allowed of us. And to the end the Catholic worship, may, with the more decency and security, be exercised at Edinburgh, we have thought fit to establish our chapel within our palace of Holyrood-house, and to appoint a number of chaplains and others, whom we authorize and require you to have in your most special protection and care, as persons whom we are resolved to maintain in their just rights and privileges, and to secure under our royal protection. (Wodrow, vol. iv. pp. 389, 390.)

As a contrast to this avowed determination of his majesty to maintain and promote

popery, we shall give another proclamation issued against Mr. Renwick on the 9th of December, which shows in no unequivocal terms his antipathy to the Protestant faith:— “Forasmuch as one Mr. James Renwick, a flagitious and scandalous person, has presumed and taken upon hand, these several years bygone, to convocate together numbers of the unwary and ignorant commoners to house and field conventicles (which our law so justly terms the nurseries of sedition and rendezvous of rebellion;) we, out of our royal care and tenderness to our people, being desirous to deliver all our loving subjects from the malign influence of such a wretched impostor, have, therefore, prohibited and discharged all our subjects, that none of them offer or presume to harbour, reset, supply, &c. but do their utmost endeavour to pursue him as the worst of traitors. And if in the pursuit of the said Mr. James Renwick, he, or any of his rebellious associates, resisting to be taken, any of our subjects shall happen to kill or mutilate him or any of them, we hereby declare that they, nor none assisting them, shall ever be called in question.” In conclusion, the sum of one hundred pounds sterling was offered for his

apprehension, dead or alive. (Life of Renwick, p. 128.)

This year was closed by another of those barbarous murders, so many of which it has been our painful task to relate. In the month of December, David Steel, in the parish of Lesmahagow, was surprised by Lieutenant Crichton in the fields, while in hiding. Upon the promise of Crichton that his life would be spared, Steel surrendered himself into his hands; but that faithless and unfeeling wretch ordered him to be instantly shot.

The plans which were devised, and in part executed by James during 1686, for the relief of the papists and the extension of property, were more clearly developed in 1687. Before adverting to these, however, we shall adduce some further proofs of the continuance of that persecuting spirit which had been hitherto evinced by government against the Covenanters. The council and justiciary court were employed for several months in the beginning of this year, indicting multitudes for treason, either for the affair at Bothwell, or for the late unsuccessful attempt made by Argyle. Many of these trials being in absence, the parties implicated were found guilty, forfeited, and “de-

cerned to be executed to death when apprehended." Others were fined or banished, several condemned to death, and—as if ashamed of their sanguinary proceedings against Protestants, while so many favours were heaped upon Papists—a few were pardoned.

Two instances of the court of justiciary proceedings will be sufficient here. John Anderson, younger of Westerton, was indicted on the 25th of July, for having said in a company at Edinburgh, on the 8th of March preceding, "that it was lawful for subjects to rise in arms for their own defence, and that otherwise no man's life or property was secure." Though the prisoner humbly acknowledged that he had uttered that expression, and not only renounced it, but threw himself on the mercy of the court, he was condemned to be executed to death, and demeaned as a traitor, the time and place of his execution to be left with his majesty. "It was now high time," says Wodrow, when narrating this case, "for the people to awake out of their lethargy, when people were condemned to die for asserting the plainest and most certain principles." (Hist. vol. v. p. 412.)

The other case was that of James Boyle, who was indicted for being at Bothwell, disowning the king's authority, "by adding treasonable limitations, in asserting that he was not king till he took the covenant," and conversing with and hearing Mr. Renwick. Unlike the martyrs, whose life it is pretended, would have been spared had they but yielded in the smallest point, Boyle acknowledged the rising at Bothwell to be rebellion, owned the king to be his lawful sovereign, and while he confessed that he had heard Mr. Renwick preach, professed his sorrow for the *crime*, and denied connexion with that zealous Covenanter. Yet these acknowledgments were now disregarded, and Boyle was condemned to be executed in the Grassmarket. (Wod., vol. iv. p. 412.) It would appear that he was subsequently reprieved; but even if such a renunciation was insufficient to avert the sentence of death being passed, let not the memory of the genuine and conscientious Covenanters be traduced for holding fast their principles, "without wavering," and disregarding both the smiles and the frowns of their persecutors, continuing until death faithful to the cause of Christ.

A more effectual method, however, of ridding the kingdom of the Covenanters, was by banishment. After robbing and plundering them of the little property which they yet retained, the majority of those who fell into the hands of the council were doomed to perpetual slavery. For refusing to "acknowledge the present authority to be according to the word of God,"—to disown the Sanquhar declaration—and to engage never to hear Mr. Renwick preach in time coming—fifteen men and five women were, in the beginning of April, banished to America; and they were speedily followed by others equally faithful to the principles of the reformation. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 341.)

The ravages of the military throughout the country were at the same time continued with little or no abatement; a striking example of which appears in the case of the Mayfield family, in the parish of Twinholm. The lands of Mayfield had lain waste for two years, in consequence of former depredations committed by the military, and such of the tenants as still survived had sought refuge elsewhere. A complaint having been made by the collectors that no cess had been obtained from these lands for a considerable

period, a party of soldiers was sent to seize the produce of the ground. But, to their great mortification, they found the ground to be uncultivated and run to waste. They were resolved, however, not to return without some remuneration, and they accordingly convened all the inhabitants of the district, and ordered them to pay the cess for the lands of Mayfield. This being refused, the military seized their cattle, pretending that they had been fed upon the Mayfield grounds, and the poor people had to repurchase them at prices amounting to double the sum required for the cess.\*

Notwithstanding the persecutions to which the Covenanters were subjected, the society people continued to assemble for public worship in the most sequestered parts of the country, and to hold their general meetings for mutual edification, and concerting measures for the general welfare of the whole body. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 286.) Aware that several expressions in the declarations which they had already published were misrepresented, they drew up, in the beginning

\* Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 414. "The same course," says that author, "was taken for uplifting the king's feus in those lands.

of March, their "Informatory Vindication," which, being revised by Mr. Renwick, was printed in Holland, and distributed, as widely as possible, among the members of the societies. In this document, which for candour and moderation, may vie with many published at a period very different in point of tranquillity, they say, "If in any thing we have in the manner of managing affairs in reference to the public cause, through ignorance or imprudence, jointly miscarried, having good designs, and the thing not attended with obstinacy, our weakness and insufficiency in the abounding confusions of these preceding times, (our faithful guides and men of understanding, by death and otherwise being removed) should be compassionately looked upon and tenderly handled. Whatever may have been our miscarriages, this is our sincere and professed design, purpose, and resolution, to lay out ourselves to the utmost of our power, according to our places and stations, for promoting and propagating the work of reformation, closely adhering to our worthy reformers, and those who have constantly walked in their footsteps, steadfastly wrestling against the corruptions and innovations of the times, continuing succes-

sively the testimony for the reformation; and that our study is, to keep ourselves unpoluted with the abounding abominations of this our day, and to hold fast the truths of God, not losing them among our own hands, but conveying them down to the succeeding generation, equally guarding ourselves against right or left hand extremes.” They state that they were not to be understood as claiming, in the Sanquhar and Lanark declarations, the character of formal representatives of the nation; and that in disowning Charles II. they did not proceed judicially and authoritatively, but simply declared their own private judgment, refusing to own him “as standing in a magisterial relation to them.” Their declaration of martial war they explained as directed solely against the tyrant; but as to such as strengthened or sided with him, “they declared they would oppose them, not with arms, but by their profession, practice, and testimony.” (*Inflammatory Vindication*, pp. 33—42.)

While the Covenanters, amidst persecution of every kind, were thus actively employed in endeavouring to maintain the cause of Presbytery, the king was zealously and arbitrarily engaged in promoting the ad-

vancement of popery. A letter was received by the council from James, dated 12th February, enclosing a proclamation for an indulgence, by which the Roman Catholic disabilities were completely removed, and a toleration, such as it was, granted to Protestants.

In this letter his majesty says, “Whereas by our letter of the 21st August last, we were graciously pleased to inform you of our designs, in order to the ease of our Roman Catholic subjects—we have now thought fit to publish these our royal intentions, and to give an additional ease to those of tender consciences, so as to convince the world of our inclinations to moderation, and to evidence that those of the clergy, who have been regular, are our most particular care, though we have given some ease to those whose principles we can with any safety trust: we have at the same time expressed our highest indignation against those enemies of Christianity, as well as government and human society, the field-conventiclers, whom we recommend to you to root out with all the severities of our laws, and with the most vigorous prosecution of our forces,

it being equally our and our people's concern to be rid of them."

The proclamation of the indulgence was quite in accordance with this letter. "We," says the tyrant, "by our sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power, which all our subjects are to obey, without reserve,\* do hereby allow and tolerate the *moderate* Presbyterians, to meet in their private houses, and there to hear all such ministers as either have or are willing to accept of our indulgence allenarly, and none other, and that there be not any thing said or done contrary to the will and peace of our reign, seditious or treasonable, under the highest pains these crimes will import; nor are they to presume to build meeting-houses, or to use out-houses or barns, but only to

\* Can those who in the present day so justly condemn the conduct and rejoice in the deposition of the ex-king of France, Charles X. for his infringements on the civil rights of his people, either vindicate the tyrannical and lawless measures of the two brothers who for twenty-eight years ruled Britain with a rod of iron, or censure the Covenanters—"those patriots who toiled, and for their country's cause, bled nobly,"—to whose exertions we are indebted for all that is valuable both in civil and religious liberty? No, the very indignation which is manifested by all parties at the illegal proceedings of the infatuated Bourbons, completely justifies—were justification from man at all necessary—the unyielding opposition of the Covenanters to a race of monarchs, equally, nay much more despotic.

exercise in their private houses as said is. In the mean time it is our royal will and pleasure, that field conventicles, and such as preach or exercise at them, or who shall any-wise assist or connive at them, shall be prosecuted according to the utmost severity of our laws made against them. And, considering the severe and cruel laws made against Roman Catholics (therein called papists) we by our sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power aforesaid, suspend, stop, and disable all laws or acts of parliament, customs, or constitutions, made or executed against any of our Roman Catholic subjects, in any time past, to all intents and purposes, making void all prohibitions therein mentioned, pains or penalties therein ordained to be inflicted, so that they shall, in all things be as free, in all respects, as any of our Protestant subjects whatsoever, not only to exercise their religion, but to all offices, benefices and others, which we think fit to bestow upon them in all time coming.” In conclusion, the test was abolished, and a new oath substituted, obliging all who accepted of the indulgence to maintain and defend James and his successors in their absolute power and authority ; and, to remove

the fears of the prelates, an assurance was given—on the word of a king who was now above all law—that he would not meddle with the church lands, “as long as people carry themselves right.” (Wodrow, vol. iv. pp. 417, 418.)

This proclamation—which received the name of King James’s first indulgence—gave satisfaction to no party in Scotland, except to the servile councillors and the papists. It displeased the majority of the Episcopalian, who however desirous to extirpate Presbytery, were very averse to admitting the Roman Catholics to power. It was, on the other hand, decidedly rejected by the Presbyterians, and especially by the society people, who treated it with that scorn which it richly merited. The council, however, not only published it with great pomp, but returned a letter of thanks to James, expressive of their high satisfaction at the promise he had given to maintain the religion established by law.\*

\* Burnet, vol. iii. p. 1216. Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 422. Burnet acknowledges that in this indulgence “the king resolved to go on in his design of breaking through all laws. His claiming absolute power, to which all men were bound to obey without reserve, was an invasion of all that was either legal or sacred.”

On the 31st of March, James granted a second indulgence, by which the council were permitted to dispense with the oath, and to suffer Presbyterian ministers to preach in private houses *during his majesty's pleasure*. Although the Presbyterians refused to accept of this second insult on their religion and civil rights, yet one or two ministers—without regard to the indulgence—having preached in private houses, the council magnified it as a compliance of the whole body; and James proceeded to adopt similar measures in regard to England. After having grievously persecuted the Dissenters in that kingdom, the crafty monarch with a view to establish popery on the ruins of all denominations of Protestants—declared himself to be the friend of universal toleration. Aware of his intention, however, the Dissenters, forgetting their own grievances, decidedly refused to assist in the destruction of the established Church.\*

Having granted such unbounded liberty of conscience in England, James found it necessary to extend the toleration to Scot-

\* Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 424. Concerning this second indulgence Shields says, it "was only busking the hook better that they might bite more kindly."—Life of Renwick, p. 130.

land. On the 28th of June, accordingly, a third indulgence was granted, which, though evidently intended to favour the papists, was accepted of by many of the Presbyterian ministers. In this royal edict, his majesty, as usual, “by his sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power,” suspends, stops, and disables, all penal and sanguinary laws made against any for non-conformity to the religion established by law. He then proceeds as follows:—“We do give them (the Presbyterians) leave to meet and serve God after their own way and manner, be it in private houses, chapels, or places purposely hired, or built for that use, so that they take care that nothing be preached or taught among them which may any wise tend to alienate the hearts of our people from us or our government,\* and that their meetings be peaceably, openly, and publicly held, and all persons freely admitted to them, and that they do signify and make known to some one or more of the next privy councillors, sheriffs, &c. what place or places they set apart for these uses, with the names of the preachers: Provided always, that their meet-

\* That is, in plain English, they shall neither preach nor pray against popery.

ings be in houses, or places provided for the purpose, and not in the open fields, for which now, after this our royal grace and favour shown (which surpasses the hopes and equals the very wishes of the most zealously concerned,) there is not the least shadow of excuse left; which meetings in the fields we do hereby strictly prohibit and forbid, against all which we do leave our laws and acts of parliament in full force and vigour.”\*

This indulgence was accepted of by the greater part of the Presbyterian ministers, who immediately proceeded to erect meeting houses in various parts of the kingdom, and to preach the gospel to their hitherto persecuted countrymen. Having assembled in Edinburgh on the 20th of July, these ministers resolved to draw up a flattering address to the king, thanking the tyrant, who had trampled on all law both civil and ecclesiastical for so unlooked for a favour. In this address, they use the following language, which, to say the least of it, is very unlike what might have been expected from professed Covenanters. “From the deep sense we have of his ma-

\* Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 426.—This proclamation was more cautiously worded, says Burnet, “only absolute power was so dear to them, that it was still asserted.”—Hist., vol. iii. p. 1218.

jesty's gracious and surprising favour, in not only putting a stop to our long sad sufferings for non-conformity, but granting us the liberty of the public and peaceable exercise of our ministerial function, without any hazard; as we bless the great God who hath put this into your royal heart, do withal find ourselves bound in duty to offer our most humble and hearty thanks to your sacred majesty, the favour bestowed being to us, and all the people of our persuasion, valuable above all our earthly comforts, especially as we have, amidst all former temptations, endeavoured, so we are firmly resolved still to preserve an entire loyalty in our doctrine and practice, and by the help of God, so to demean ourselves, as your majesty may find cause rather to enlarge than to diminish your favours towards us.”\*

\* Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 428.—The ministers at this meeting were under no necessity to present any address to James. It is vain for Wodrow, therefore, to colour over this address, by saying that these ministers acted not by delegation from the rest of Scotland, neither as any judicatory, but simply as an occasional meeting. This only rendered their servile address still more exceptionable, seeing it expressed sentiments in which the nation at large did not concur, and which were utterly unworthy of men who professed to adhere to principles for which so many of their brethren had shed their blood. It would have been their wisdom, therefore, to have remained silent, and not to have expressed so

Actuated by a nobler spirit, the society people held the giver and the gift in equal contempt ; and though exposed both to the obloquy of their more compliant brethren, and to the persecution of the common enemy, they fearlessly maintained their principles, and refused to accept at the hand of a papist a boon which he had no right either to withhold or bestow. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 310.) Their reasons for acting so decided a part, are far from being unsatisfactory. They considered this toleration as flowing from his absolute power—a power which all were bound to obey without reserve, and which could not be limited by law—and they could not therefore accept of it without acknowledging a power inconsistent with the law of God and the liberties of mankind. Besides, they conceived this pretended liberty to be most dishonourable to the cause of Christ ; for, though nothing is more desirable than when true liberty is established by the government, yet nothing can be more vile than when the true religion is tolerated under the notion of a crime, and

much loyalty, in their doctrine and practice, to one whom, in the year following, they rejoiced at seeing banished for ever from the throne.

when the exercise of it is only allowed under such and such restrictions. "It is further declared in the proclamation," say they, "that 'nothing must be preached or taught, which may any way tend to alienate the hearts of the people from him or his government.' Now here is the price at which they are to purchase their freedom, (a sad bargain to buy liberty and sell truth,) which yet hardly can be so exactly paid, but he may find a pretence for retrenching it when he pleases; for if a minister shall pray or preach against the church of Rome as Babylon, or against any public sin, a popish or Romish bigot shall interpret it to be an alienation of the people's hearts from the king and his government." (Hind Let Loose, p. 182, et seq.)

The rejection of this ensnaring indulgence subjected Mr. Renwick and his adherents to increased persecution. The council on the 5th of October published another proclamation against them, denouncing as traitors, not only "all such persons, whether preachers or hearers, as shall presume to be at any conventicle in the open fields, but also all dissenting ministers, who shall take upon them to preach in houses, without observing such directions as are prescribed by our late pro-

claimation.”\* The threats and the bribes of the persecutors were equally disregarded by the Covenanters, who, though “in jeopardy every hour,” continued to set at defiance all their mandates, and to hold fast those principles for which thousands of their brethren had suffered and died.



## CHAPTER IX.

Sufferings of the indulged ministers—apprehension of Mr. Renwick—his trial and sentence—his behaviour in the prison and on the scaffold—his triumphant death—Mr. Renwick is succeeded in his ministerial labours by Mr. Shields—outrages of the military—rescue of Mr. Houston—antipathy of government to Presbyterianism—arbitrary conduct of James—birth of the Prince of Wales—the Protestants look for deliverance to William, Prince of Orange—examination of Mr. Gordon—announcement of an invasion by the Prince of Orange—address of the bishops to James—William lands in England—James abandons the kingdom, and flies to France—riot in Edinburgh—the curates expelled from their churches—convention of estates—the Revolution completed—conclusion.

THE year 1688—a year which will be for ever memorable in the annals of Great Bri-

\* Here was already a proof given of the unchristian restrictions connected with the late indulgence; and it was not long before many of those ministers who had accepted of it were persecuted in one form or another, under pretence that they did not observe the prescribed directions of the council. The fact is, that the indulgence was intended for the establishment of popery alone, and when that object was accomplished, the indulgence would be withdrawn, and the Presbyterians become the first victims to Romish cruelty.

tain—was ushered in by events that threatened to extinguish the last ray of hope to the Covenanters. On the 2d of January, a proclamation was published, announcing the queen's pregnancy, for which public thanksgivings were ordered to be offered up to God. As if now perfectly certain of the triumph of popery—the Jesuits confidently predicting the birth of a prince—the antipathy of government to the Presbyterians began to manifest itself even against those who had accepted of the indulgence. Under pretence that the ministers did not conform to the conditions on which the toleration was granted, many of them were silenced or imprisoned, and several of them were tried for their life. Claverhouse, as usual, was among the most zealous persecutors of these ministers, as well as of those who scorned to be fettered by those ignoble restrictions of the tyrant. The people who abandoned the parish churches and resorted to the indulged ministers, were exposed to innumerable sufferings ; and not a few of the meeting-houses, as soon as opened, were, upon one pretence or another, ordered to be shut. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 437.)

But if the more compliant Presbyterians were harassed and oppressed, we may ima-

gine somewhat of the sufferings of those who set their faces fearlessly and resolutely against all the unhallowed deeds of a despotic and bigoted government. At the head of these distinguished patriots stood Mr. Renwick, who, on the sides of mountains, or in solitary glens, preached the gospel of salvation to the multitudes who attended his ministrations.

At length, however, this amiable and zealous Covenanter also fell into the hands of the persecutors. Having given in to the moderator of the meeting of ministers held the preceding year in Edinburgh, a paper against the indulgence, Mr. Renwick repaired to Fife, where, at the peril of his life, he preached the gospel to his countrymen till the last day of January. He then returned to the capital, and lodged in a friend's house on the castle-hill ; but in consequence of the numerous spies who quartered in the city, he was soon found out, and a scheme devised for his apprehension. John Justice, a custom-house officer, who had been for some time on the alert, immediately proceeded to the house, and under pretext of searching for contraband goods, demanded admittance. On Mr. Renwick's attempting to escape by a back door, one of the party by whom the house

was surrounded, struck him a blow on the breast, in consequence of which he fell, after having run to the head of the Cowgate, where he was seized and lodged in the guard-house. (*Life of Renwick*, p. 139.)

He was several times examined in private before the council, and on the 3d of February he received his indictment to stand trial before the justiciary court. Among other charges, the following accusations were brought against him:—"That in consequence of having shaken off the fear of God and regard to his majesty's laws and authority, as well as having entered into the society of some rebels of most damnable and pernicious principles, and disloyal practices, he had taken upon him to be a preacher to these traitors, and had become so desperate a villain as openly to preach in the fields, declaiming against the king's authority, asserting that he was an usurper, and that it was unlawful to pay cess, but lawful for subjects to rise in arms and make war against him, and those commissioned by him; for which crimes he had been denounced and inter-communed, and a reward of one hundred pounds sterling offered for his apprehension; notwithstanding which, he had still persisted

in his obstinacy, keeping conventicles in the fields, and requiring his hearers to come armed to these rendezvous of rebellion," &c.

After receiving his indictment, his pious mother, who was permitted to visit him, having on one occasion asked what were his feelings in so trying a situation? "Since my last examination," replied Renwick, "I can hardly pray." Seeing her startled at his answer, he added, "I can hardly pray, being so much taken up with praising, and ravished with the joy of the Lord." "But how shall I look unto that head," said she, "and these hands set up among the rest upon the ports of the city? I have so much of self, that I shall never be able to endure it." With a smile, he told her that she should never be called upon to endure such a trial; "for," said he, "I have offered my life to the Lord, and have sought that he may bind them up, that they may do no more; and I am persuaded that they shall not be permitted to torture my body, nor touch one hair of my head further." (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 355.)

On the 8th of February, he was placed at the bar of the justiciary court; and on his indictment being read, he was asked if

he acknowledged the charges there brought against him. "All," he replied, "except where it is said, I have cast off all fear of God; that I deny; for it is because I fear to offend God and violate his law, that I am here standing ready to be condemned." He was then interrogated if he owned authority, and especially King James VII. as his lawful sovereign? "I own all authority," replied the prisoner, "that hath its prescriptions and limitations from the word of God; but cannot own this usurper as lawful king, seeing, both by the word of God, such an one is incapable to bear rule, and likewise by the ancient laws of the kingdom, which admit none to the crown of Scotland, until he swear to defend the Protestant religion, which a man of his profession could not do." The following questions were then pressed upon him, Could he deny him to be king? Was he not the late king's brother? Had the late king any children lawfully begotten? Was he not declared to be successor by act of parliament? "True," he replied, "James was no doubt king *de facto*, but not *de jure*: that he was brother to the other he knew nothing to the contrary. What children the other had he did not know; but from the word of God,

which ought to be the rule of all laws, or from the ancient laws of the kingdom, it could not be shown that he had, or even could have any right." He was next asked if he owned, and had taught it to be unlawful to pay cesses and taxes to his majesty. "For the present cess," said he, "exacted for the present usurper, I hold it unlawful to pay it, both in regard it is oppressive to the subjects, for the maintenance of tyranny, and because it is imposed for suppressing the gospel. Would it have been thought lawful for the Jews, in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, to have brought every one a coal to augment the flame of the furnace to devour the three children, if so they had been required by that tyrant? And how can it be lawful, either to oppress poor people for not bowing to the idols the king sets up, or for their brethren to contribute to what may help forward their oppression? Q. Do you own that you have taught your hearers to come armed to your meetings, and, in case of opposition, to resist? A. It were inconsistent with reason and religion to do otherwise. Yourselves would do it in the like circumstances. I own that I taught them to carry arms to defend themselves, and to resist your unjust vio-

tence. Q. Do you acknowledge the note-book, [a MS. book found on his person when apprehended], with the two sermons in it, and that you have preached them? A. If you have added nothing, I will own it, and am ready to seal all the truths contained therein with my blood." (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 450.)

The base practice of the council in selecting for jurymen such as they knew would submit to be fined rather than serve, was resorted to in Mr. Renwick's case, a considerable number of the forty-five being attached to the principles for which he was arraigned. Fifteen were, however, at length obtained devoted to the cause of tyranny ; and on the prisoner being asked if he objected to any of them, he replied, that he did not ; but "protested that none might sit on his assize who professed Protestant or Presbyterian principles, or an adherence to the covenanted work of reformation." He was of course found guilty, and condemned to be executed in the Grassmarket on the Friday following. On being asked if he desired longer time, he replied, "It was all one to him ; if it were protracted, it was welcome ; if it were shortened, it was welcome ; his Master's time was the

best." With the view of inducing him to comply, he was however respite by the court till the 17th, but he steadily refused to make any concessions which in the smallest degree might be construed as a receding from his principles.

During the few days now allotted to him on earth, though his friends were denied all access to him, he was teased and harassed both by papists and prelates. Bishop Paterson, in particular, often visited him. On one occasion, the bishop said to him, "Think you none can be saved but those of your principles? Will you kill yourself with your own hands, seeing you may have your life upon so easy terms?" "I never said nor thought," replied Renwick, "that none could be saved except they were of those principles; but these are truths which I suffer for, and which I have not rashly concluded on, but deliberately, and of a long time have been confirmed that they are sufficient points to suffer for." On another occasion, a curate having asked him his opinion concerning the toleration and those who had accepted of it, Mr. Renwick told him that he was decidedly against the toleration; but candidly acknowledged that he thought the acceptors of it to

be godly men. The popish priests, again, who visited him, left him as they found him, declaring, as they retired, that he was a most obstinate heretic. (*Life of Renwick*, p. 151.)

On the day of his execution, his mother and sisters, together with one or two friends, were permitted to see him, with whom he took some small refreshment, and spent the few moments which intervened in exhortation, prayer, and praise. When the drum beat for his execution, in an ecstatic frame of spirit he exclaimed, "Let us be glad and rejoice, for the marriage of the Lamb is come; and I can in some measure say, I am ready." He ascended the scaffold with the greatest cheerfulness, where he was met by one of the curates, who again officially said, "Mr. Renwick, own our king, and we shall pray for you." "I am come here," replied the martyr, "to bear my testimony against you, and all such as you are." "Own our king, and pray for him, whatever ye say of us," returned the curate. "I will discourse no more with you," rejoined Mr. Renwick; "I am in a little to appear before him who is King of kings, and Lord of lords, who shall pour shame, contempt, and confusion on all

the kings of the earth that have not ruled for him.” (Scots Worthies, p. 561.)

Notwithstanding the base practice of the beating of drums all the time he was on the scaffold, he addressed the spectators to the following effect:—“I am come here this day to lay down my life for adhering to the truths of Christ, for which I am neither afraid nor ashamed to suffer; nay, I bless the Lord that ever he counted me worthy, or enabled me to suffer any thing for him; and I desire to praise his grace that he hath not only kept me free from the gross pollutions of the time, but also from many ordinary pollutions of children; and such as I have been stained with, he hath washed me from in his own blood. I must tell you that I die a Presbyterian Protestant. I own the word of God as the rule of faith and manners. I own the confession of faith, larger and shorter catechisms, &c., covenants national and solemn league, acts of general assemblies, and all the faithful contendings that have been for the work of Reformation. I leave my testimony, approving the preaching of the gospel in the fields, and the defending of the same by arms. I adjoin my testimony to all that hath been sealed by blood shed either on scaffolds, fields,

or seas, for the cause of Christ. I leave my testimony against Popery, Prelacy, Erastianism, &c., against all profanity, and every thing contrary to sound doctrine and the power of godliness; particularly against all usurpations and encroachments made on Christ's right, who is the 'Prince of the kings of the earth,' who alone must bear the glory of ruling his own kingdom, the church; and in particular against the absolute power usurped by this usurper, that belongs to no mortal, but is the incommunicable prerogative of Jehovah; and against this toleration flowing from that absolute power." Here he was ordered to be done, and go up the ladder. Having prayed amidst great interruption, he said to his attending friend at the time the napkin was tying over his face, "Farewell! be diligent in duty; make your peace with God through Christ; there is a great trial coming. As for the remnant I leave, I have committed them to God: tell them from me not to weary nor be discouraged in maintaining the testimony; let them not quit nor forego one of those despised truths. Keep your ground, and the Lord will provide you teachers and ministers; and when he comes, he will make these despised

truths glorious in the earth.” He was then turned over the ladder with these words in his mouth, “Lord, into thy hands I commit my spirit, for thou hast redeemed me, Lord God of truth.” (Cloud of Witnesses, p. 358. Faithful Contendings, p. 324. Life of Renwick, p. 157. Fountainhall, vol. i. p. 495.)

Thus died the amiable and pious James Renwick, one of the most upright and consistent of the Covenanters, as well as most distinguished patriots and Christians in that or in any succeeding age. He was but twenty-six years of age when he fell a victim to popish, prelatic, and tyrannical cruelty; and was the last who publicly sealed with his blood that testimony for adhering to which so many of his brethren had suffered death during the preceding twenty-seven years. “He was,” to use the words of a cotemporary and a follower, “a lively and faithful minister of Christ, and a worthy Christian, such as none who were entirely acquainted with him could say any other but that he was a beloved Jedidiah. Though he was the Joseph that was sorely shot at and grieved, yet he was the Caleb that followed the Lord fully. When I speak of him as a man, none more comely in features, none more

prudent, none more brave and heroic in spirit, yet none more meek, more humane, and condescending. His converse was pious, prudent, and meek; his reasoning and debating were the same, carrying along with them a full evidence of the truth of what he asserted; and for steadfastness in the way of the Lord, few came his length. He learned the truth and counted the cost, and so sealed it with his blood." (Mem. of Nisbet, pp. 200, 201.)

Mr. Renwick was succeeded in his labours among the society people by Mr. Alexander Shields, who continued to preach the gospel to the poor wanderers in fields or in houses, equally regardless of the threats of the persecutors and of the obloquy of professed friends. His first field meeting was held in April, upon Distinkcornhill, in Ayrshire, which was attended by a great concourse of people. This meeting proved, however, the cause of much suffering, not only to the persons present, but to the whole inhabitants of the district, the military being let loose on the people in that county to harass and plunder at discretion. (Faithful Contendings, p. 323.)

Neither were the outrages of the military

confined to spoliations and robberies; assassinations and bloodshed at times still continued to mark their progress in their crusades against the Covenanters. George Wood, for example, a young man, or rather a boy, of sixteen years of age, having been found in the fields at night, by a dragoon of the name of Reid, was seized, and without a single question being asked, shot through the head. On Reid being afterwards challenged for his conduct, he justified himself by an argument which appears to have given complete satisfaction. "He knew him," he said, "to be one of the whigs, and they ought to be shot wherever they were found." (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 457.)

A new pretext was furnished to the council, in June, for increasing the persecution against the Presbyterians. Mr. David Houston, who had formerly joined with Mr. Renwick in preaching to the Covenanters in the fields, having been apprehended in Ireland, was sent under a strong guard to Edinburgh to stand trial before the justiciary court. Aware of his fate, should he reach the capital, a number of people attacked the soldiers at Crichton-path, in Ayrshire, and with the loss of one or two on each side, rescued the

minister, and sent him off in safety. Enraged at the success of this bold attempt, the council immediately issued a proclamation, on the 22d of June, ordering the nobility, freeholders, heritors, and indulged ministers, in the counties of Ayr, Lanark, Renfrew, and Nithsdale, to be assembled on the 29th of that month, and those of Wigton on the 6th of July, "in order to find out such as were engaged in the said rescue." But after the strictest search, not one of those concerned was apprehended, though the people in these and the adjoining counties were subjected to innumerable hardships and losses by an irritated soldiery. (*Faithful Contendings*, p. 337.)

While the people in the country were thus oppressed, the Presbyterians in the metropolis were exposed to outrages equally cruel and illegal. Claverhouse and Colonel Douglas made a strict search throughout the city for Covenanters; nay, every private sentinel received orders to examine, upon oath, all concerning whom the smallest suspicion was entertained; and such as refused to swear that they for ever renounced the covenants, were dragged to prison. These disgraceful proceedings were followed by a proclamation

against the reading or retaining in any person's possession the works following :—“ All translations of Buchanan de Jure Regni, Lex Rex, Jus Populi, Naphtali, the Cup of Cold Water, the Scots Mist, the Apologetical Declaration, Mene Tekel, the Hind Let Loose, the treasonable proclamations issued at Sanguhar, and those issued out by the late Duke of Monmouth and the late Earl of Argyle.” Every copy of any of these publications was ordered to be delivered up to the council by a given day, under the heaviest penalties. This proclamation was enforced by a general search throughout the booksellers' shops in Edinburgh, where not only the prohibited works were seized, but every book written against popery, under pretext “ that the selling of these tended to alienate the people's minds from his majesty.”\*

\* The following anecdote of one of the Edinburgh booksellers deserves to be noticed. During this search, one of the privy council, having repaired to the shop of a staunch whig, inquired of him if he had any prohibited works. The bookseller desired him to search, which having done, and found none, he next interrogated him if he had any books against popery. A great many, was the reply. The councillor informed him that popery being the king's religion, subjects ought not to be alienated from their sovereign, and desired a sight of the obnoxious publications. Upon which the bookseller directed him to a particular place, which was filled with bibles. Taking up one after another, and examining them, the councillor said, “ These are bibles.”

Notwithstanding all these atrocities, the society people still continued to hold their meetings as well as to assemble together, either in fields or in houses, for the public worship of God. They had been reduced to great poverty in consequence of the frequent fines, robberies, and plunderings to which they had been subjected; yet poor as they were, they resolved to endeavour the ransoming of several of their brethren who had been sold for slaves. At their general meeting, accordingly, which was held on the 1st of August, they collected no less a sum than two hundred and forty pounds sterling, by means of which *thirteen* individuals in Barbadoes were redeemed from slavery. (Faithful Contendings, p. 344.)

During these transactions in Scotland, James acted a part in England, which in a few months afterwards assisted in hurling him from a throne to which he ought never to have been raised. Determined on the full establishment of popery, he not only issued a second indulgence, in which his absolute power was unequivocally asserted, but or—“They are so,” replied the bookseller, “and from the one end to the other are all against popery.” This was deemed so heinous an offence, that the bookseller was summoned before the council in the afternoon, “and there brought to considerable trouble.”—Wodrow, vol. iv p. 444.

dered it to be read after divine service in all the churches of the kingdom. This mandate was resisted by several of the prelates, seven of whom presented a petition to the king, humbly requesting that he would not insist on their reading a declaration which would make them parties in the publication of what had been declared illegal by parliament. Encouraged at this unlooked for opposition, James committed the refractory prelates to the tower, and determined to bring them to trial. The people were instantly aroused; thousands of all ranks attended them both to prison and to Westminster-hall on the day of trial; and when the jury returned a verdict of *not guilty*, a shout burst from the spectators, which being conveyed to the crowds without, was carried into the city, and propagated with the greatest joy throughout the kingdom. (Burnet, vol. iii. p. 1267, et seq. Hume, vol. viii. p. 271.)

A few days before the acquittal of the bishops, the queen was delivered of a son. From previous whispers, however, as well as from the mystery attending his birth, (Burnet's Hist., vol. iii. p. 1281, et seq.) the people in general believed that an imposition was intended, and that a supposititious child

was palmed upon the nation. Whatever, either of truth or of falsehood, was in this rumour, the very idea of a popish heir to the throne filled the Protestants with the greatest alarm; and all eyes were now directed to Mary, James's eldest daughter, who was not only herself a Protestant, but united in marriage to William Prince of Orange, the great champion of Protestantism and civil liberty in Europe.

No sooner did the news of the birth of an heir to the crown reach Scotland, than the council issued a proclamation, dated 14th June, in the following terms:—"We thank the great King of heaven for so extraordinary a mercy, fitted to unite all our hearts, and prevent all our jealousies; not doubting, but that all his majesty's loyal subjects will express their solemn and sincere joy upon so signal an occasion; and that they will put up their ardent prayers to the Almighty, to whom they owe this hopeful prince, for prolonging his life, in which they ought to be concerned, as in their chief earthly blessing, next to that of his royal parents, whom God preserve. And for this end, we, the lords of his majesty's privy council, do, by his majesty's special warrant, appoint and ordain,

that a solemn and public thanksgiving be kept and observed in all the churches of this his majesty's ancient kingdom :—and we require and command the magistrates of all burghs royal, that they cause the said thanksgiving and solemnity to be observed with all suitable marks of joy and congratulation within their respective burghs.” (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 441.) But while the council were thus calling upon the nation to offer up their thanksgivings to God for the birth of a prince by whom the galling chains of popery were expected to be rivetted on the three kingdoms, the Protestants sighed in secret over the mournful prospect which lay before them and earnestly wished success to the meditated attempt of the Prince of Orange—who already had expressed his willingness to comply with the reiterated requests of the patriots of Britain—to deliver the country from civil and religious despotism.

The expected invasion of William, instead of leading the council to adopt conciliatory measures, seemed to inflame their resentment against all who professed Presbyterian principles. The following instance of their tyranny on one against whom nothing could be charged inimical to the present govern-

ment will prove—if further proof were necessary—that the crisis had now arrived when a revolution was as necessary as it was desired. Mr. Charles Gordon, minister at Campvere, being in Edinburgh in the month of August on a visit, and perceiving the unsettled state of the country, was anxious to return as soon as possible to his charge. Aware of the difficulty of travelling without a pass, he applied to the chancellor for one; but, to his astonishment, he was cited before the council, and interrogated by Perth as follows:—“*Q.* Do you own the king’s authority? *A.* Yes. *Q.* Do you pray for the Prince of Wales? *A.* No. *Q.* Why not for the Prince of Wales? *A.* There is no particular order for praying for him, and I have not used to pray for all the particular branches of the royal family by form. *Q.* Whom do you mean when you pray for the royal family? *A.* All the princes and princesses of the family. *Q.* Do you not include the Prince of Wales? *A.* My lord, I do not exclude him. *Q.* But do you not include him? Mr. Gordon was silent; upon which the chancellor added, “There is the matter: Sir, I perceive I have not been mistaken nor misinformed concerning you.” At another

examination he was ordered to subscribe a paper, acknowledging the king's son to be prince of Scotland and Wales, and promising to pray for him as such. On his urging that in conscience he could not subscribe that paper, though he neither denied nor disowned the prince of Wales, the chancellor exclaimed, "This is such a mortal sin, a crime, that it is enough to damn you." "I hope," replied Mr. Gordon, "there is more mercy with God than to condemn me for ignorance and weakness." "Yes," rejoined the chancellor, "it is enough to damn you and a thousand with you, for by your calling this in question,\* you are guilty of their sin and damnation who follow your example." After this examination, Mr. Gordon was committed prisoner to the castle; and it was not without the greatest efforts being made on the part of his friends, together with an humble petition from himself to the chancellor, that he obtained his liberty. (Wodrow, vol. iv. pp. 458—460.

Many of the indulged ministers were subjected to similar sufferings. Among others, Mr. Thomas Cobham in Dundee, and Mr.

\* He had not even called it in question.

David Williamson in Edinburgh,\* were imprisoned, though they could be charged with no offence against the existing laws. But they were Presbyterians, and as such they were obnoxious to a popish and despotic government.

While the council were thus employed in endeavouring to crush the very last remains of liberty in an already enslaved country, tidings arrived of the certainty of an invasion by the Prince of Orange. Yet though these tidings alarmed the unhallowed junto, they did not lead them to adopt conciliatory measures. Determined on supporting tyranny, the council issued a proclamation ordering the militia to be embodied, beacons and signal posts to be erected, and every part of the country put in a posture of defence.

James himself, who had hitherto acted a part so arbitrary and overbearing, was now constrained to ask the advice of the very bishops whom he had so lately persecuted with such rigour. But the counsel of the English bishops was too humiliating for a popish despot to follow. They advised him,

\* Mr. Williamson appears to have been imprisoned at the instance of the curate of St. Cuthbert's church. West Kirk Session Record for February, 1688.

in a paper, dated 3d October, “to put the management of the government into the hands of Protestants; to dissolve the ecclesiastical commission court; to suppress the schools of the Jesuits; to desist from his dispensing power; to restore the charters; to call a free and regular parliament; and, above all, to permit his bishops to offer such motives and arguments, as they trusted might, by God’s grace, be effectual to persuade his majesty to return to the communion of the church of England.” (Burnet, vol. iii. p. 1343.)

The very day on which the English prelates gave this salutary advice to the king, the Scottish council tendered to him their lives and fortunes, humbly asking directions how to conduct themselves in the present emergency. James was highly pleased with their devotedness to his service, and, in return, enjoined them to imprison all suspected persons; and—seeing he had given orders for the regular troops to march into England—to raise such forces as they thought necessary for the defence of the kingdom. (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 368.)

As a contrast to the conduct of the bishops in England, we shall transcribe the following extract from an adulatory address by the

prelates in Scotland : “ We prostrate our selves,” say these base sycophants, “ to pay our most devout thanks and adoration to the sovereign majesty of heaven and earth, for preserving your sacred life and person, so frequently exposed to the greatest hazards, and as often delivered, and you miraculously prospered with glory and victory, in defence of the rights and honour of your majesty’s august brother, and of these kingdoms ; and that by his merciful goodness, the raging of the sea, and the madness of unreasonable men, have been stilled and calmed, and your majesty, as the *darling of heaven*, peaceably seated on the throne of your royal ancestors, whose long, illustrious, and unparalleled line, is the *greatest glory* of this your ancient kingdom. We magnify the divine mercy in blessing your majesty with a son, and us with a prince, whom we pray heaven may bless and preserve to sway your royal sceptres after you ; and that he may inherit, with your dominions, the illustrious and heroic virtues of his august and most serene parents. We are amazed to hear of the danger of an invasion from Holland, which excites our prayers for an universal repentance from all orders of men, that God may yet spare his

people, preserve your royal person, and prevent the effusion of Christian blood ; and to give such success to your majesty's arms, that all who invade your majesty's just and undoubted rights, may be disappointed and clothed with shame ; so that on your royal head the crown may still flourish." They conclude with the greatest professions of unshaken loyalty, and with wishing the king the hearts of his subjects, and the necks of his enemies. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 458.)

Before this servile address reached the king, William had landed in England. His declaration had been already published, and, notwithstanding the efforts of government, circulated throughout both kingdoms, and received with almost universal approbation. In that declaration, all the grievances of the nation were enumerated : such as the dispensing and suspending power ; the filling of all offices with papists ; the open encouragement given to popery ; the annulling of the charters of all the incorporations ; the treating of the most humble petitions as seditious ; and the violent presumptions against the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales. (Hume's Hist., vol. viii. p. 292.) In regard to Scotland again, William enumerates all the oppressions, plun-

derings, and murders which had been the lot of the Presbyterians since the Restoration, "for no other reason," says he, "but because they would not answer or satisfy evil counsellors, officers, and soldiers, in such questions as they put to them, without any warrant of law, and against the common interest of mankind; besides a great many other violences and oppressions to which that poor nation hath been exposed, without any hope of having an end put to them, or to have any relief from them." (Crookshank, vol. ii. p. 372.)

William sailed from Helvoetsluys on the 9th of October, with a fleet of nearly five hundred vessels, and an army of fifteen thousand men. He was however driven back by a storm, an event which so elevated the cowardly monarch, that several of the concessions, which, in the terror of the moment, he had made to the nation, were immediately recalled. The prince's loss being soon repaired, he again set sail on the 1st of November, and arrived safely at Torbay on the 5th, the anniversary of the gunpowder plot. The next day he commenced his march, and arrived at Exeter, and very soon afterwards multitudes of all ranks flocked to his standard. (Burnet, vol. iii. p. 1354.)

During these commotions in England, Scotland assumed an aspect which might have been expected from the long and severe oppressions to which that kingdom had been subjected. James, having endeavoured to tamper with the indulged Presbyterian ministers, was answered by the cutting reply, that the toleration which he had granted was intended for the ruin, and not the protection, of the Protestant religion; and that they would act in the present juncture “as they should be directed by Divine Providence.” The society people—who had uniformly refused to abandon one iota of their principles—were still more decided. At a general meeting, held on the 24th of October, at Wanlockhead, in Nithsdale, they resolved, “that duty and safety seemed to require rising in a posture of defence; for it would be a reproach, when now the quarrel would be stated for religion and liberty, if they who have born arms hitherto for the defence thereof, should now lay them by as indifferent; that their appearance in that posture should not be sudden, for that would be to expose themselves as a prey, nor should it be at all, if the expedition should only be for England; but that it should only be attempt-

ed when the expedition in that kingdom was so far advanced as all the country were in a combustion, and generally pressed to declare themselves on what side they were. And to this effect it was agreed that their gathering should be toward that place of the country commanded by the Dutch, and that some should be appointed to wait at Edinburgh to give intelligence to all quarters of the time when they should land in Scotland." (Faithful Contendings, p. 365.)

Meanwhile the Prince of Orange slowly advanced towards London, while the bigoted monarch, now deserted by his dearest friends, and even by his own daughter, formed the resolution of abandoning the kingdom, and seeking refuge in France. The army, the navy, and in short the whole kingdom, having declared for William, the popish tyrant found it necessary to give way to the torrent which he had neither the courage nor the ability to resist, and, contrary to the advice of the few who still adhered to his evidently desperate cause, he fled from the country, and became a fugitive in a foreign land.

The declaration of the Prince of Orange had been received and published throughout

Scotland with the greatest avidity, in spite of the threats and menaces of the council. It was openly published at Glasgow, Irvine, Ayr, and other places, while the mandate of government, prohibiting the circulation of false news, was every where treated with the greatest contempt. It was in Edinburgh, however, that the riotings assumed any thing like an alarming appearance. There the council had for a series of years abused that power with which they were entrusted ; and now when all the regular troops were called to England, they were left in a manner defenceless, and shortly afterwards found it necessary to vote a voluntary dissolution.

Multitudes had flocked to the capital on the first rumours of an invasion ; and no sooner were the troops withdrawn, than a spirit of zeal against popery was evinced, which defied the now feeble efforts of the administration to control. The abbey of Holyroodhouse was particularly obnoxious to the community, as being the place of meeting not only for popish worship, but for the school of the Jesuits. The palace was guarded by an independent company, under Captain Wallace, who, by his extensive preparations for defence, soon attracted the at-

tention of the infuriated populace. On the 9th of December a few individuals, who were walking through the park, having approached the abbey, were ordered by the military to retire. These persons immediately hurried into the city, and alarmed the inhabitants by a report that the abbey was full of armed men. In consequence of these reports, a crowd, chiefly of students and apprentices, soon collected, and, after threatening to burn the provost's house for his refusing at first to deliver up the keys of the city, proceeded to the cross, where they read a proclamation, offering a reward of four hundred pounds sterling to any who should apprehend Perth\* or Melford, dead or alive. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 473.)

Early next morning the town council was assembled, and a proclamation issued, "discharging tumults, and ordering parents and masters to keep their servants and children within doors." This paper was no sooner published than it was torn at the cross, and scattered to the winds. In the evening the crowd again assembled, and being inflamed by reports of intended massacres, they pro-

\* The bigoted and persecuting chancellor found it necessary, on this juvenile intimation, to retire from the city.

ceeded to the abbey, with the view of demanding admittance, gathering strength as they went along. Wallace, who had drawn up his men at the foot of the Canongate, ordered them to fire on the crowd as soon as they approached, in consequence of which, between thirty and forty of the inhabitants were wounded, and a few killed. A general rush upon the soldiers followed, which forced Wallace, after having two of his men killed, and several wounded, to retreat into the abbey, the gates of which were immediately shut.

Irritated at the loss of their companions, the crowd, after disposing of the dead and wounded in houses adjoining, proceeded to the city, and dispersing in houses and closes, each party consulted what was proper to be done. They at length resolved to solicit the assistance of a number of gentlemen who were assembled in a tavern; and their application having been successful, the magistrates found it necessary to acquiesce in the now unanimous demands of the inhabitants. The train-bands were consequently raised, the town-guard mustered, and the magistrates, preceded by two heralds, and followed by the whole inhabitants of the city, pro-

ceeded to the abbey. But though a formal summons, in the name of the council, was sent to Wallace, he decidedly refused to surrender. After firing a few shots, Major Graham, at the head of the trained bands, obtained entrance into the abbey by a back passage, which Wallace had left unguarded, upon which the whole military fled. The apprentices, who had followed Graham, put twelve of the soldiers to death before the gentlemen who were present could afford them protection, while the rest of the crowd, having broken into the chapel, effectually destroyed every vestige of popish idolatry. Great efforts had been made by the priests to preserve the images; but these being at length found out, were carried in mock procession through the streets, and then committed to the flames. (Wodrow, vol. iv. p. 473.)

The rioting was continued on the day following; and the civil power being almost annihilated, the crowd proceeded to ransack the houses of the papists, carrying away and burning every relic of idolatry on which they could lay their hands. To complete the scene, the students, with the sanction of the magistrates, publicly committed the effigy of the sovereign pontiff to the flames.

The example of the metropolis was speedily followed by the inhabitants of Glasgow and several other places, whose zeal against popery, and indignation against tyranny, though manifested in a somewhat different manner, appeared equally conspicuous.

The society people, who had been so long “persecuted, afflicted, tormented,” were not idle during these commotions. Reports having been spread that ten thousand Irish papists were landed in Scotland, and burning Kirkcudbright, they simultaneously ran to arms. Finding these reports to be groundless, they proceeded to redress their own grievances, expelling the unworthy curates from the parishes on which they had been obtruded, and destroying all monuments of popish idolatry which fell into their hands. “They thought,” says Burnet, “that the time was now come, not only to procure themselves ease and liberty, but to revenge themselves upon others. They generally broke in upon the Episcopal clergy with great insolence and much cruelty.\* They

\* Burnet here speaks like all other Episcopal writers. That the Presbyterians treated the curates with ignominy and scorn, and even rudely expelled them from the places which they never ought to have possessed, is granted; but that *cruelty* was used, has never yet been proved; not one curate, however obnoxious as a persecutor or an informer, being put to death. “Im-

carried them about the parishes in mock procession, tore their gowns, and drove them from their churches and houses.” But though the curates had laid themselves open to the utmost vengeance of an infuriated people, in consequence of the cruel part which they had acted for so great a length of time, they were subjected to no personal violence, further than what necessarily attended their being “drummed out” of their respective parishes. No bloodshed or plunder stained the hands of the Covenanters. Their moderation in the hour of triumph was equalled only by their patience and courage in the season of trial. What a contrast to the conduct of the Episcopalians!

The throne being declared vacant by the parliament of England, in terms which the reader may compare with the declarations of the society people,\* William and Mary were proper as were these excesses,” says Cook, “how light were they when put in the balance against the enormities which, under Prelacy, had been perpetrated! for no personal violence, no tortures, no murders, disgraced a sect which had been borne down with every species of outrage. Here incidental ebullitions of popular sentiment had no connexion with the general arrangements of the Presbyterians, who prudently considered what steps should be taken to regain their influence, and to carry on, with the accession of the new sovereign, the settlement of their church.”—Cook, vol. iii. pp. 438, 439.

\* The English parliament declared, “That King James

declared king and queen, and proclaimed with the greatest joy on the 13th of February, 1689. The convention of estates in Scotland met on the 14th of March, to whom the society people presented a very affecting address. “By all the formerly felt, presently seen, and, for the future, feared efforts of power and tyranny,” say they; “by the cry of the blood of our murdered brethren, by the sufferings of the banished free-born subjects of this realm, now groaning in servitude, being sold into slavery in the English plantations of America; by the miseries that many thousands forfeited, disinherited, harassed, and wasted houses have been reduced to; by all the sufferings of a faithful people for adhering to the ancient covenant-ed establishment of religion and liberty,—we humbly beseech your honours, that you will proceed without any delay to declare the wicked government dissolved, the crown and throne vacant, and James VII. whom we never owned, to have really forfeited and rightly to be deprived of all right and title he ever had, or could ever pretend to have

the Second, having endeavoured to subvert the constitution, *by breaking the original contract between the king and the people, did abdicate the throne.*”

nitherto, and to provide that it may never be in the power of any succeeding ruler to aspire unto, or arise to such a capacity of tyrannizing. Moreover, since anarchy and tyranny are equally to be detested, and the nation cannot subsist without a righteous governor, as also that none can have a nearer right or fitter qualifications than his illustrious highness the Prince of Orange, whom the Most High has singularly owned, and honoured to be our deliverer from popery and slavery; we cry therefore to your honours, and crave that king William, now proclaimed king of England, may be chosen and proclaimed also king of Scotland,—with such necessary provisions and limitations as may give just and legal securities for the peace and security of religion, the stability of our laws, privileges of parliament, and liberties of the people,” &c. Having requested that the king might be obliged to profess and preserve the pure religion and the work of reformation, they conclude thus,—“ Upon such terms as these we render our allegiance to king William, and hope to give more pregnant proofs of our loyalty to his majesty in adverse as well as prosperous providences, than they have done, or can do, who profess


implicit subjection to absolute authority, so long only as Providence preserves its grandeur.” (Crookshank, vol. ii. pp. 329, 330.)

Although the convention did not acquiesce in every particular of this address, they came to the following decision :—“ That king James VII. being a professed papist, did assume the royal power and acted as king without ever taking the oath required by law, and hath, by the advice of wicked and evil counsellors, invaded the fundamental constitutions of this kingdom, and altered it from a legal limited monarchy to an absolute and despotic power, and hath exercised the same to the subversion of the Protestant religion, and the violation of the laws and liberties of the nation, inverting all the ends of government, whereby he hath forfeited the crown, and the throne is become vacant,—and that the crown be conferred on the prince of Orange.”\*

Thus, after twenty-eight years of the most grievous persecution, was the nation delivered from popery, prelacy, tyranny, and sla-

\* Here the Scottish convention recognises the principle, so long contended for by the Covenanters, that when rulers abuse the power with which they are entrusted, the people may depose them. Several thousand Covenanters had been sacrificed by the house of Stuart for maintaining the very sentiments which were adopted by the convention in 1689.


very, and the Presbyterians restored to their privileges and rights. We make no remarks on the transactions which followed. It is enough that we have brought the history of the Covenanters to the period at which they were placed beyond the reach of persecution, and the church of Scotland was restored to the liberty which she enjoyed before the throne of England was filled by the first of the Scottish monarchs. For the accomplishment of this revolution, the three kingdoms lie under no small debt of gratitude to the Covenanters. They suffered and bled both in fields and on scaffolds for the cause of civil and religious liberty ; and shall we reap the fruit of their sufferings, their prayers, and their blood, and yet treat their memory either with indifference or scorn ? No ; whatever minor faults may be laid to their charge, whatever trivial accusations may be brought against them, it cannot but be acknowledged that they were the men who “ singly and alone ” stood forward in defence of Scotland’s dearest rights, and to whom we at the present day owe every thing that is valuable to us either as men or as Christians.













2047. HECCL.

Author [Sime, William.]  
Title History of the Covenanters. Vol. 2.  
S.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

Do not remove  
the card  
from this  
pocket.

Made by LIBRARY SUPPLY, Boston  
Under Part "Ref. Index File."  
Acme Library Card Pocket

